



Meeting note

Project name	Little Crow Solar Park
File reference	EN010101
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	11 February 2019
Meeting with	IRNG SOLAR (Little Crow) Ltd
Venue	TQH
Meeting objectives	Project Update Meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Update on draft Development Consent Order

The Applicant was preparing their draft Development Consent Order (dDCO), at present they had yet to identify any obvious need for protective provisions. The Applicant asked about the likely timetable for review of draft documents. The Inspectorate advised that eight weeks was the current expected timeframe for advice to be given on a dDCO, though this may be shorter if only specific questions or novel aspects of the dDCO are highlighted to the Inspectorate. The Inspectorate requested that a draft Explanatory Memorandum (EM) and certain key plans be provided with the dDCO as draft documents to provide necessary context.

The Inspectorate asked when the submission of draft documents is likely to happen, the Applicant was waiting until the end of statutory consultation before deciding when it would submit draft documents. The Inspectorate noted that the Applicant would have to leave time to consider the comments the Inspectorate made on the draft documents. The Inspectorate queried whether any Compulsory Acquisition would be necessary, the Applicant replied that it was trying to ensure that it would not be necessary.

The Inspectorate advised that it is moving towards electronic submission of documents. It no longer needed hard copies of documents at submission of the application, though these may be requested at a later stage.

The Inspectorate asked the Applicant, if the application is accepted for Examination, whether any potential venues had been considered. Forest Pines Conference Centre was discussed but the Council will be consulted on this.

Update on Statutory Consultation

The Applicant provided an overview of ongoing consultation including a timeline of dates such as:

- **3 August 2018:** Submissions of draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to North Lincolnshire Council
- **29 November 2018:** North Lincolnshire Council agree to SoCC
- **3 December 2018 to 4 March 2019:** Statutory consultation

The Applicant spoke about the responses received from consultation so far, highlighting the lack of responses received and that many of those that had been received were neutral towards the project. The Applicant stated that they have a team contacting statutory parties who had not yet responded to the consultation to ensure they have received all relevant responses. The Inspectorate asked about the preparation of Statements of Common Ground with any other parties. The Applicant answered that it had yet to receive replies from those it planned to develop them with. The Inspectorate

advised on recording all aspect of consultation in the consultation report including all efforts made to seek responses to the proposals.

EIA: Scoping Opinion

The Applicant queried whether it could scope out further assessment of effects on Great Crested Newts if it provided sufficient evidence for this. The Inspectorate confirmed that insufficient evidence had been provided at scoping stage and that the only method of formally amending a Scoping Opinion is to request a subsequent Scoping Opinion. However, the Inspectorate drew the Applicant's attention to paragraph 3.1.3 which states that "The Inspectorate is content that the receipt of a Scoping Opinion should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultees to scope such aspects/ matters out of the Environmental Statement (ES), where further evidence has been provided to justify this approach." This would require a revised methodology with clear justification and the approval of the relevant regulator.

The Inspectorate noted that it had not agreed to scope out other areas of assessment such as emissions from construction vehicles due to inconsistencies in how traffic flows had been described in different sections of the Scoping Report. The Applicant stated that this was due to uncertainty in traffic data and would ensure that a consistent description of traffic flows would be provided in the ES.

The Applicant asked whether an assessment of effects relating to the former oil well could be scoped out, since it was planning on excluding that site from the red line boundary. The Inspectorate advised that the Applicant should provide information regarding the history of the oil well, including data about the condition of the underground asset within the Environmental Statement (ES) in order to understand the potential for ground and groundwater contamination to be present that could be mobilised during groundworks in adjacent areas and that any potential contamination/pollution risk should be assessed.

The Applicant queried what assessment was required in relation to adjacent plantation woodland that was relied on for visual screening of the site. The Inspectorate stated that the worst case scenario assessed in the ES needed to consider the possibility of the woodland being partially or clear felled. The Applicant replied that clear felling of the woodland is very unlikely and that it would include a programme of planned forestry activities within the ES to support this position.

The Applicant noted that glint and glare were not proposed to be assessed as a separate chapter. The Inspectorate advised that the Applicant should consider these matters as part of the landscape and visual impact assessment or evidence why they were being excluded from the ES.

The Applicant asked what information it needed to provide in relation to Electro-magnetic field (EMF) effects. The Inspectorate noted that this matter had been raised by Public Health England in its consultation response and that a risk based explanation regarding the likelihood of significant EMF effects should be provided.

The Inspectorate advised that any confidential appendices to submitted in the ES, such as a badger appendix, should be clearly marked as such and a front sheet provided for publication on the Inspectorate project page.

Major accidents and disasters were discussed. The Inspectorate queried whether there was any fire risk associated with the battery storage facility. The Applicant replied that it was using lithium batteries which didn't carry a significant fire risk. The Inspectorate advised that this should be explained within the ES.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Applicant will inform the Inspectorate of the timeframe for submission of draft documents after the end of statutory consultation.