



SUNNICA ENERGY FARM

EN010106

Volume 5

Reports/Statements

5.2 Consultation Report Appendices J-1 - J-5

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Section 37(3)(c) Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009



Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

**Sunnica Energy Farm
Development Consent Order**

Consultation Report Appendices

Regulation Reference:	Regulation 5(2)(q)) and Planning Act 2008 section 37(3)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	EN010106
Application Document Reference	EN010106/APP/5.2
Author	Sunnica Energy Farm Project Team

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 00	18/11/21	Application Version

Appendices

Contents

Appendix J-1: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008	
4	
Appendix J-2: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(b) of PA 2008	
482	
Appendix J-3: Regard had to comments from consultees under s47 of PA 2008	730
Appendix J-4: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008	
2243	
Appendix J-5: Regard had to comments in response to additional consultation under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008	2352

Appendix J-1: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008

Table J-1.1 below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Section 6.2 of the **Consultation Report [EN010106/5.1]**.

Table J-1.1: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(a) of PA 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The Parish Council support renewable energy and the location area of the proposal despite its opposition to the Scheme.	Barton Mills Parish Council	No	The Applicant welcomes the support for renewable energy generation and the site selection. The Applicant has submitted a Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] as well Appendix 4A: Alternatives Assessment of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of its Development Consent Order (DCO) application. These documents set out the rationale for the Applicant's choice of site. This is accompanied by a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] which outlines the need for the Scheme.
Land use	The suggested blanket ban on public access during the construction is totally unacceptable, closures to the Rights of Way network should only be made when essential on safety grounds. It must be stated that where the Rights of Way are on the	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	All existing PRoW within the Scheme boundary are retained and will remain accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRoW during construction. The PRoWs would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	edge of the site closures are unlikely to be required. It is too easy for a developer to ask to shut down all the network and the interests of users must be fully considered.			[EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRoW is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users.
Land use	The loss of 2,792 acres of valuable farmland must be given much thought. The Applicant unfairly categorises the land as Grade 3b or 4. The land has been in continuous use as farmland for generations. Carefully managed using rotations of cereals, root crops and livestock, the light soil around Freckenham is valued for its excellent drainage and lack of large stones. These characteristics allow the growth of high-quality crops at above average yields, and minimise the time when the land cannot be worked due to the waterlogging more	Freckenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	commonly found on more clay-based soils. Given Brexit and the need for UK food security, all productive farmland is needed. We cannot just continue importing food and attempting to export the connected carbon emissions.			follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. The scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), further to the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Planning Inspectorate (ES Appendix 1B [EN/1010106/APP/6.2]) does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The loss of 2,792 acres of valuable farmland must be given much thought. Though unfairly categorised by Sunnica, there is significant indication that the data used for the land quality assessment is outdated and needs to be updated, the land has been in continuous use as farmland for generations. Carefully managed using rotations of cereals, root crops and livestock, the light soil is valued for its excellent drainage and lack of large stones. These characteristics allow the growth of high quality crops at above average yields, and minimise the time when the land cannot be worked due to the	Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The Applicant does not consider this to be an 'unfair assessment'. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	waterlogging more commonly found on more clay-based soils.			follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The data used for the agricultural land classification assessment consists of new data collected on behalf of the Applicant, we well as data from two previous ALC assessments within the Site area. These were a Reading Agricultural Consultants ('RAC') survey for a consented minerals development and a Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) survey on land to the east of the A11. Normal agricultural land management will rarely, if ever, affect the ALC grading of land. The grading is based on the long term physical and chemical limitations of land for agricultural use. The current or historic agricultural management, or intensity of use, does not affect the ALC grade. ALC grading could potentially only be improved by very major and expensive interventions, well beyond the scope of normal agricultural works. Therefore, the data used for the assessment from the previous RAC and MAFF surveys is not considered to be outdated. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Appendix 4A Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. The Applicant recognises that is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of conserving the national resource of agricultural use against the benefits of renewable energy generation.
Land use	Losing farmland (and therefore lowering food security) at a point in time when there is more uncertainty in the world, reduced trade liberalisation and arguably Britain's relative wealth may be declining is not a smart strategy. It is estimated that following the UK's poor 2020 wheat harvest we will need to import 5 million tonnes of wheat to satisfy our annual consumption requirements.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. The scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), further to the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Planning Inspectorate (ES Appendix 1B [EN/1010106/APP/6.2]) does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	Greenpeace has expressed concerns about the Cleve Hill development (a third of the size of Sunnica), arguing that “vast continuous fields of panels on agricultural land” were not “the best way to go solar”. Solar panels are for roof space, brownfield sites and small areas of low-quality agricultural land, they should not be taking up large areas of good quality farmland in an area of Europe that on average only has 1570 hours of sunlight per annum. How can Sunnica justify this?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be ‘best and most versatile’ (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being ‘best and most versatile’ and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. East Anglia has high levels of irradiation and therefore the Applicant considers the location to be suitable for a solar farm. Further information on this is provided within Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	This corner of East Anglia cannot support such a vast scheme and its impact will blight the area for generations.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has given significant consideration to the siting of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant has sought to use land that is not considered to be 'best and most versatile' (agricultural land classification grades 1, 2 and 3a). This has been a key consideration in choosing the location for the project. Proximity to the grid connection is also an important consideration and the land proposed for inclusion within the Order Limits is considered to be appropriate for solar and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				battery storage development, being within a 15km radius of the Burwell National Grid Substation. The Applicant is proposing a project of this size to meet a national need for new forms of renewable energy generation. This requires that new forms of energy generation come forward to connect to the national electricity grid. As the United Kingdom is aiming to meet its net zero climate obligations and to replace older forms of energy generation, projects of this kind are required to provide clean forms of energy generation to the national electricity grid. Further details of the need for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm are provided in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant recognises the potential for the Scheme to cause environmental impacts and has prepared an Environmental Statement in accordance with relevant guidance and best practice and in consultation with stakeholders including the host authorities. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] as submitted has built upon the work outlined in the PEIR and where significant adverse effects are

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				identified, the Applicant is proposing mitigation.
Land use	We were led to believe that this site was chosen because the Burwell substation is a capable of taking this extra energy capacity that Sunnica would generate. However, we have now heard that this is not the case and significant funds will need to be spent to upgrade elements of the substation. Therefore, this area isn't unique in being able to support this scheme. The NSIP process requires developers to explore all options for developments. Can Sunnica demonstrate that they have done this?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	An analysis of potential alternative locations for the Scheme (including brownfield sites) was undertaken as included in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. As outlined in Chapter 4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], the Applicant has carried out a point of connection (POC) search which identified Burwell as a location which has available capacity with reinforcement that could be completed within a reasonable timeframe and cost and is therefore deemed to be a suitable location to be the POC. The identification of Burwell as the POC narrowed the area of search within East Anglia to within the vicinity of Burwell within which to locate a large-scale solar development.
Land use	We are concerned that under the proposal Worlington and Freckenham are pretty well cut off during the construction. Routes should be closed for a minimum	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant agrees that disruption should be minimised. The PRoWs would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	period when work is taking place and sensible alternatives established.			closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRoW is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users.
Land use	We recognise the need for renewable energy, but we feel greater emphasis in Suffolk should be given to providing solar panels on south facing roofs of houses and commercial buildings where the energy is collected at the point it is needed.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. The Applicant is of the view that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The proposed Sunnica Energy would generate a significant volume of renewable energy over the duration of its operating life. The Applicant has provided analysis within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] that sets out the benefits created by larger, single, solar projects in being able

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				to deliver low carbon electricity more quickly and at a lower cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same generating capacity.
Land use	Many of the Rights of Way will be replaced by a path beside a 2-meter deer proof fence which significantly impacts on the views of open countryside and the public's enjoyment of access in the countryside. In some cases, a path in open countryside will be replaced by a corridor with 2-meter-high fences either side.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	Views from PRoWs during construction will be affected, in a number of cases there will be significant effects on views during construction due to machinery presence. These effects are described and detailed in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The overall effect on amenity on PRoW users during construction from noise and visual impacts as well as PRoW closures (effect interactions) is assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects are predicted from these effect interactions on users. Views from PRoW during operation will also be affected, in a number of cases there will be significant effects (see Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). These effects are expected to reduce over time as the vegetation planting intended for screening of the Scheme matures To minimise disturbance, the Applicant is proposing to locate photovoltaic (PV) modules away from PRoW. The proposed

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				locations for solar stations can be found in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2]. Further information is also provided in the Section 11.8 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. Inverters, switchgear and other equipment will be located away from PRoW.
Land use	SLAF is concerned by the total lack of increase in the Rights of Way network. A particular concern is Bridleway 204/5 where the visual presentation does not reflect the true position covering the full view from the A14 overbridge.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is proposing new permissive routes are at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further details of the permissive routes proposed can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Details are also

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				provided in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant is not able to provide a dedicated PRow through the Scheme as the ability to create such rights is not contained within the Applicant's land agreements. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3]. All viewpoints have been reviewed and re-assessed following changes to the Scheme design. The location of the viewpoints has been agreed with the host authorities with additional viewpoints also included after the consultation following discussions with the host authorities. The range of representative viewpoints are considered proportionate for the assessment of the Scheme. The baseline methodology has been revised following discussions with the host authority. The Applicant's viewpoints include one north-east from the PRow (bridleway) 204/5, crossing the A14 (figures 10-65A and 10.65B of the ES). Further information can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.1], with the location of the viewpoints can be viewed in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Land use	The loss of 2792 acres of valuable farmland must be analysed. Though incorrectly categorised by Sunnica as Grade 3b or 4, the land has been in continuous use as farmland for generations. Carefully managed using rotations of cereals, root crops and livestock, the light soil around Snailwell is valued for its excellent drainage and lack of large stones. These characteristics allow the growth of high-quality crops at above average yields, and minimise the time when the land cannot be worked due to the waterlogging more commonly found on more clay-based soils. Given Brexit and the need for UK food security, all productive farmland is needed. We cannot just continue	Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The Applicant does not consider this to be an 'unfair assessment'. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	importing food and attempting to export the connected carbon emissions.			brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. The scope of the EIA, further to the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Planning Inspectorate (ES Appendix 1B [EN/1010106/APP/6.2]) does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	There is an anaerobic digester plant located in the middle of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm located at Bay Farm, Worlington. There is also a small solar farm next door? The plant will use feedstock such as sugar beet, maize, agricultural by-products such as sugar beet pulp and vegetable out grades and animal manures grown near and around the AD plant. These crops are likely to be grown on land Sunnica has highlighted for their development. This means we could be swapping one source of renewable energy for another which is already established in the area. Furthermore, to meet the feedstock requirements crops will then need to be grown further away which will increase the distance these feedstocks will have to be	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the operation of the Bay Farm Anaerobic Digester as part of the planning context of the Scheme set out in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. Approval of a non-material amendment NMA(A)/15/2109 to the original planning permission in 2019 explains that that the operators of the ADP plant are no longer using sugar beet and maize from the approved feedstock area which Sunnica East Site B; Sunnica West Site A; and Sunnica West Site B fall within. The non-material amendment allows an amendment to the traffic management plan to source feedstock from elsewhere allowing deliveries of other biomass products to be made via the A11. Notwithstanding this the agricultural landowner supplying sugar beet and maize has confirmed that the supply could still be met with the remaining land within the catchment area. It is considered that the proposed Scheme does not have an effect on the Anaerobic Digester Plant or its traffic movements.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	transported and thus add to the carbon footprint of the plant. Biogas is produced at this plant which contributes towards green energy targets. Another part of the AD process is that digestate is also produced. Digestate is a nutrient rich fertiliser which is used on the nearby land to increase its fertility. To meet the requirements of other local crop processors such as British Sugar they too may have to increase the distance from which they source their raw material, increasing food miles due to land near the digester having been lost to solar. Please can this anomaly be explained?			
Land use	What will happen to the land at the end of the 40 years? The assumption that it would return to productive farmland having been "rested" ignores the fact that it will have been shaded by panels for the duration. Rain shadows and	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme's operations on soil conditions in Chapter 12: Socio economics of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant's assessment considers the impact on soil resources during

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	changed ground temperatures under the huge areas of panels will have affected the Breckland soil and subjected it to significant wind erosion. There is also the question of "current land use" classifying the land as brownfield/industrial and not agricultural since this will be judged not by today's legislation but that in 40 years' time.			construction and operations to be 'negligible'. Case studies given in Good Agricultural Practice Guidance for Solar Farms shows little reduction in forage yield from shading. Permanent green cover will reduce wind erosion, soil is vulnerable to this when bare after cultivation. The Scheme is expected to operate for a period of 40 years at which point it would be decommissioned and both the planning and practical use of the land would no longer be considered as solar use. The PV modules would be secured to the ground by steel piles with limited soil disturbance and could be removed in the future with no permanent loss of agricultural land quality likely to occur, provided the development is undertaken to high standards. Details of the proposed requirements for the management of this are set out in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Once decommissioned, the land will be returned to the landowners and the Applicant will have no further control over its use.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The majority of schemes of this size are located in deserts. Never before has a scheme like this been so close to villages and consumed so much agricultural land. Why have Sunnica chosen to locate the industrial solar scheme here?	Chippenham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has considered land within a 15km search area from the point of connection at Burwell National Grid Substation. Details of the process are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has made changes to its proposed design following the statutory consultation that take areas proposed for solar development away from Chippenham. Parcels W13, W14 and W16 (shown in page 11 of the consultation booklet, Appendix G-4) are no longer within the Order limits. The Applicant is proposing a significant volume of planting to the north of parcels W08 and W10 to screen the areas from Chippenham Park and Chippenham village. This is shown in Figure 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The sheer size and scale of this proposal is too big - consumes vast areas of Agricultural land. Land is capable of producing 3.5 tonnes per acre of wheat, 1.5 tonnes per acre of oilseed rape. Lost food production from the area of land has to be replaced from elsewhere, potentially by importation, this shifts the global emissions problem, create power but shift to transportation and associated carbon emissions.	Kennett Parish Council	Yes	The need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size. In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has made a number of design changes, which have resulted in the total developable area of the project (the area where the infrastructure for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will be located: PV modules, battery energy storage, and cabling) being reduced. Further information on this is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant has assessed the impacts of the change in land use within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The scope of the EIA, further to the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Planning Inspectorate (ES Appendix 1B [EN/1010106/APP/6.2]) does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	Loss of this agricultural land at Sunnica West Sites A and B is a big concern to the Parish council.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). The majority of the land (96.2%) within the sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant recognises that is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation.
Land use	The removal of footpaths and the ugliness of the panels will mean people are less likely to take exercise and enjoy the local countryside, which has been so important to many, especially in the recent months of lockdown.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is not proposing to close all PRow for the duration of the construction period. As the PRow's will be closed for a short duration (maximum of 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed. Rather, alternative options are available in the local area and diversion signs indicating those routes will be provided. Further details can be found in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The Scheme proposes new permissive routes; at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Views from PRow during operation will be affected, in a number of cases there will significant effects (see Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. These effects are expected to reduce over time as the vegetation planting intended for screening of the Scheme matures.
Land use	The developer must ensure other paths are created in mitigation to this loss of amenity. The proposals are woefully inadequate with this regard. The scheme provides an opportunity to create new paths for cyclists, walkers and equestrians and links between the communities that are short of paths and links at present.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	Yes	The Applicant has amended its proposals for permissive routes in light of feedback received during the statutory consultation. The proposed permissive routes are at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Further details of the permissive routes proposed can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Details are also provided in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant is not able to provide a dedicated PRoW through the Scheme as the ability to create such rights is not contained within the Applicant's land agreements. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3]. The Applicant has not secured an agreement with the relevant landowners to enable the use of permissive paths by horse riders. The Applicant is proposing permissive routes for the duration of the Scheme's lifetime to provide additional recreational opportunities. The aim of this is to mitigate impacts caused by the construction and operation of the Scheme. Following the end of the Scheme's operating life and decommissioning, such impacts will no longer exist, and therefore the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				accompanying mitigation through the permissive routes will no longer be required.
Land use	We are concerned to see that it is intended to close popular walking routes for two years during the construction period. This is simply not conducive to supporting the local residents' wellbeing. There has to be sufficient green infrastructure and access in the vicinity of a settlement, so that residents are able to use the countryside for recreation, including walking, dog walking, cycling and other activities (such as riding, for example). Natural England would not recommend the closing of routes and if this is intended we consider that you will need to provide attractive alternative routes of the same length, that will be available before the	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant notes the concerns of Natural England regarding the closure of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) during the construction period. To clarify, the Applicant is not proposing to close all PRoW for the duration of the construction period. As the PRoWs will be closed for a short duration (maximum of 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed. Rather, alternative options are available in the local area and diversion signs indicating those routes will be provided. Further details can be found in chapters 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	construction of the proposed development.			
Land use	Examination of the Agricultural Land Classification map Eastern Region (ALC008), shows that the majority of the land in Cambridgeshire to be affected by this proposal is in Grades 2 and 3. Unfortunately Grade 3 is not subdivided in this map. However, this is all good growing land and the poorer land in Suffolk is particularly prized for root vegetable production, such as carrots. We strongly question the accuracy of your soil quality assessments. These assessments were commissioned by yourselves and therefore can't be deemed to be independent and certainly don't match up to current food production from these fields. According to Natural England's ALC008 map the land in question is predominantly ALC grade 2	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment of agricultural land quality for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The agricultural land classification (ALC) survey was undertaken by independent experts who have the relevant professional skills, knowledge and expertise in the subject. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	or 3. In a country which imports over 60% of its food supply, taking an area of around 2,800 acres of productive land out of use is not in the national interest or in the interest of the environment. It will probably cause more food miles and greenhouse gas generation than it will save. CPRE considers that there should be an urgent change of national policy in relation to solar parks and farmland. There are thousands of acres of space on the roofs of warehouses, factories, office blocks and other industrial buildings in this country. It should be mandated that these are fitted with solar panels and any further take-up of agricultural land should be halted.			The Applicant has assessed the impacts of the change in land use within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The scope of the EIA, further to the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Planning Inspectorate (ES Appendix 1B [EN/1010106/APP/6.2]) does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	SLAF are concerned about the loss of good agricultural land. The applicant underplays the land quality but in recent farming times farms in this area, what was once regarded as 'poor land', have been transformed into high quality farmland for vegetable production.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment of agricultural land quality for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The agricultural land classification (ALC) survey was undertaken by independent experts who have the relevant professional skills, knowledge and expertise in the subject.
Land use	Despite your claims to the contrary, we believe the land to be high quality, well-irrigated and productive	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	farmland currently producing high yielding quality crops. In particular: -This area of land known as the East Anglian Chalks / The Brecks has the particular advantage of being suitable for planting earlier and harvested later than most other agricultural land in the UK. This helps ensure the UK has the provision of many crops such as carrots and onions throughout the year. -At a wider level, the East of England region, including the land identified for this development, is often referred to as the "bread basket of Britain," and supplies over 37% of vegetables in the UK.			avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The scope of the EIA, further to the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Planning Inspectorate (ES Appendix 1B [EN/1010106/APP/6.2]) does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector.
Land use	This scheme will take 2,792 acres of versatile, irrigated, high yielding farmland out of production.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 and is included in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Once the Scheme has been decommissioned and its infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production.
Land use	Based on established soil standards and expected site pollution we deem the suggested timescale for the return of the site to productive farmland to be wildly optimistic. We would expect there to be a minimum 40-year period between the proposed start of this project and its full return to productive agricultural use.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 and is included in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Once the Scheme has been decommissioned and its infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production. Decommissioning is expected to take a similar length of time to construction, approximately 2 years. The scope of the EIA, further to the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Planning Inspectorate (ES Appendix 1B [EN/1010106/APP/6.2]) does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). The majority of the land (96.2%) within the sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. It is also important to note that the Scheme will not involve the permanent loss of farmland. It is possible to restore land used for solar

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				energy generation to farmland at the end of a project's lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during its operational lifetime. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Land use	There can be little doubt that effective food production and distribution is crucial to both the UK economy and safeguarding our already threatened natural environment. The loss of such vast amounts of productive arable land will inevitably result in increased: amounts of imported / transported food, transportation costs associated pollution and intensive farming elsewhere, to 'plug the gap' left by the	Isleham Parish Council	No	Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Order limits is classed as not being 'Best and Most Versatile' land. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 12B [EN010106/APP/6.2]. It is also important to note that the Scheme will not involve the permanent loss of farmland. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of a Scheme's lifetime. The PV modules

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	agriculture we have lost, unemployment as a result of lost farm and industry related jobs All this at a time when: we are becoming more socially and politically committed to the protection of our natural environment. To improve our environment there is a need to reduce our carbon footprint via reduced transportation and improve our food security. Increased populations and climate change (wetter winters) will result in the need for additional planting on land such as that included in this proposal. This project would achieve the direct opposite. the UK is attempting via Brexit to become more independent and economically competitive.			would be secured to the ground by steel piles with limited soil disturbance and could be removed in the future with no permanent loss of agricultural land quality likely to occur, provided the development is undertaken to high standards. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during a Scheme's operational lifetime. The scope of the EIA does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this (including in relation to employment) are analysed in Chapter 12

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The sites are criss-crossed by a network of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs). It is promised that these will be retained during the life of the sites except for some during construction. CPRE is concerned that there appears to have been no analysis of the effects upon views for those using the PRoW network. We are also concerned at how safe the PRoW network will be, especially for children and horse riders. It is one thing to fall or be thrown from a galloping horse onto a grassy sward. It is quite another to hit a metal and silicon solar panel or to be tossed into high voltage electricity apparatus or even a security fence.	Fordham Parish Council	Yes	All existing PRoW within the Scheme boundary are retained and will remain accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRoW during construction. The PRoWs would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRoW is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users. Views from PRoWs during construction will be affected, in a number of cases there will be significant effects on views during construction due to machinery presence. These effects are described and detailed in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The overall effect on amenity on PRoW users during

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				construction from noise and visual impacts as well as PRow closures (effect interactions) is assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects are predicted from these effect interactions on users. The Scheme proposes new permissive routes; at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Views from PRow during operation will also be affected, in a number of cases there will significant effects (see Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. These effects are expected to reduce over time as the vegetation planting intended for screening of the Scheme matures. The Scheme will be fenced off by security fencing, so the solar infrastructure will not be publicly accessible. Additionally, the Scheme infrastructure is set back from

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				residential areas and roads in a number of places.
Land use	The blanket closure of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) in the area for the two-year construction period, specifically the footpaths leading from Mortimer Lane, Green Lane and through Blandings Farm, will have a significant negative effect on the recreation and well-being of residents. These PRoW are used both for connections with other areas (e.g. the footpath through Blandings Farm which connects the Icknield Way to the Circular Walk) and for circular walks and by horse riders (e.g. the footpath on Mortimer Lane, and Green Lane.). They are the only footpaths and bridleways leading to and from the village, as the roadways do not include footpaths. We do not agree that PRoW which in many cases run along the edges of the development, or	Freckenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	Yes	All existing PRoW within the Scheme boundary are retained and will remain accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRoW during construction. The PRoWs would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRoW is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users. Views from PRoWs during construction will be affected, in a number of cases there will be significant effects on views during construction due to machinery presence. These effects are described and detailed in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The overall effect on amenity on PRoW users during

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	through areas that would be subject to development margins or setbacks, need to be closed for the full construction period, causing residents and visitors a significant loss of amenity. We believe that these issues mean that the proposal does not give proper weight to amenity.			construction from noise and visual impacts as well as PRow closures (effect interactions) is assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects are predicted from these effect interactions on users. The Scheme proposes new permissive routes at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Views from PRow during operation will also be affected, in a number of cases there will significant effects (see Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. These effects are expected to reduce over time as the vegetation planting intended for screening of the Scheme matures.
Land use	In respect of existing National Grid infrastructure, this Scheme will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant	National Grid and National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas following the statutory consultation and has prepared appropriate protective provisions for National Grid and National Grid Gas' assets in close proximity to the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus. Where the Applicant intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGET's & NGG's apparatus, both will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.			Scheme. Details of these can be found in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The Applicant recognises the need for the protection of retained apparatus and has included measures to ensure this in the Works Plan [EN010106/APP/2.2].
Land use	The proposed new footpath isn't even linked to existing footpaths. It starts and goes nowhere	Isleham Parish Council	Yes	In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has amended its proposals for permissive routes during the Scheme's operating life. Locations are Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. All routes connect to existing footpaths or roads.
Land use	The scheme is stating that the land they are taking is poor quality agricultural land. On what have Sunnica	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment of agricultural land quality for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	based this conclusion? It is incorrect. The land is productive, and is currently growing potatoes, carrots, onions, parsnips, sugar beet, milling wheat, malting barley, and rye. The 1988 Agricultural Land Classifications maps show that large amounts of the farmland included in this scheme fall into class 2 and 3a, which classifies it as 'best and most versatile land'. Under existing planning policy guidelines best and most versatile land should be protected for arable production not covered by solar panels. Sunnica has not been prepared to make public during this consultation period their land survey results, which is of great concern to us.			avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The agricultural land classification (ALC) survey was undertaken by independent experts who have the relevant professional skills, knowledge and expertise in the subject.
Land use	Kennett garden village adjoins the site and there are	Kennett Parish Council	No	Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, the Scheme design has been amended. W16 has now been removed and W15 has been reduced in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	concerns over noise and visual impact.			size. Woodland planting has been designed along the edge of W15 to screen the views of modules from the future residents. Please refer to the parameters plans, as illustrated on figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. This has reduced the anticipated landscape and visual effects of the Scheme on residents within the future Kennett Garden Village. The Environmental Statement does not assess the impact on the future Kennett Garden Village. However, the future residents of the Garden Village have been considered in the design of the Scheme planting and landscape setbacks.
Land use	We note that there has been some disagreement amongst local stakeholders and the applicant concerning the quality of the agricultural land that will house the panels, and that the agricultural land classification data is not available within the submitted documents. It is important to have complete clarity regarding the quality	Natural England	No	Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Order limits is classed as not being 'Best and Most Versatile' land. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 12B [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	of agricultural land and we expect this to be provided for all stakeholders in the next stage of the DCO application.			
Land use	Agricultural land, if managed in the right way, can support wildlife, whereas it is our understanding that preliminary small-scale studies of solar farms by the Wildlife Trust on their own sites have suggested that species heterogeneity declines under the solar panels. Therefore, it does not appear likely that these sites will support biodiversity in the same way that agricultural land can if managed in a way that supports wildlife (and not using intensive farming methods).	Natural England	No	A total of 292Ha of land is to be set aside as part of the Scheme within the Order limits for habitat creation. This will include native grassland planting, wetland planting, tree planting and hedgerows. These areas (ECO1, ECO2, ECO3, ECO4 and ECO5) are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. This will be in addition to the planting beneath and between PV modules. Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] details the management measures required during operation to manage the habitat for maximum gains in biodiversity. The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	We recommend that the cumulative/in-combination assessment for this application should include consideration of the large-scale loss of land previously used for agriculture	Natural England	No	The Applicant has assessed the impacts caused by the anticipated impact on agricultural land from all parts of the Scheme within Chapter 12 Socio-Economics and Land Use, of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Order limits consist of Grade 3a, 3b and 4 land. The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant recognises that is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation.
Land use	From the description of the development this application is likely to affect a proportion of BMV agricultural land. That said, we consider that the proposed development is unlikely to lead to significant	Natural England	No	An assessment of agricultural land classification has been provided in Appendix 12B [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'Best and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	long-term loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, as a resource for future generations. This is because the solar panels would be secured to the ground by steel piles with limited soil disturbance and could be removed in the future with no permanent loss of agricultural land quality likely to occur, provided the development is undertaken to high standards. Although some components of the development, such as construction of a sub-station, may permanently affect agricultural land this would be limited to small areas.			Most Versatile' land. We agree that loss of agricultural land resource and/or quality will not occur in areas of PV modules. Any loss will be in the small extent of structures such as substations. The DCO consent will require that the land will be returned to its existing use and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will be prepared which will set out the mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. A Framework DEMP has been submitted in Appendix 10E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of the DCO Application.
Land use	During the life of the proposed development it is likely that there will be a reduction in agricultural productivity over the whole development area. It should therefore be considered whether this is an effective use of land in line with planning practice guidance	Natural England	No	The Applicant has assessed the impacts of the change in land use within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	which encourages the siting of large scale solar farms on previously developed and non-agricultural land.			Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land when selecting the Order limits. This is outlined in the Alternative Sites Assessment that has been submitted with the DCO Application in Appendix 4A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This, as well as the Alternatives chapter (Chapter 4 of the ES [EN010106/AP/6.1]) describes the process followed to consider alternative sites during the Scheme design development, and how the final Order limits were set. Previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the search area for the Scheme. Chapter 11 of the NPPF 'Making effective use of land' also prioritises residential and other commercial uses on previously developed land so solar development is secondary to this due to the nature of such development being less economically advantageous.
Land use	Local planning authorities are responsible for ensuring that they have sufficient information to apply the	Natural England	No	The Applicant acknowledges this point however the decision maker for this DCO application is the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	requirements of the NPPF. The weighting attached to a particular consideration is a matter of judgement for the local authority as decision maker. This is the case regardless of whether the proposed development is sufficiently large to consult Natural England.			The Applicant has considered the policies of the NPPF in the preparation of the DCO application.
Land use	We would also draw to your attention to Planning Practice Guidance for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (March 2014) (in particular paragraph 013) and advise you to fully consider best and most versatile land issues in accordance with that guidance.	Natural England	No	In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance the Scheme makes effective use of land with 96% of the land to be used for electricity generation being non-best and most versatile agricultural land. Consideration has also been given to the use of previously developed land when selecting the Order land which is discussed in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2], however previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the search area for the Scheme. The Applicant has assessed the impacts of the loss of best and most versatile land within Chapter 12 and Appendix 12B of

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	What is the net benefit of this renewable energy compared against losing agricultural land? All comparisons so far have been against fossil fuel.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The Applicant recognises the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	General guidance for protecting soils during development is also available in Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, and should the development proceed, we recommend that relevant parts of this guidance are followed, e.g. in relation to handling or trafficking on soils in wet weather.	Natural England	No	The Applicant acknowledges this point and has prepared its proposals in accordance with Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites. Further information on this is provided within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				during construction. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction.
Land use	The PEIR identifies the potential for impacts through the loss or change in formal Public Rights of Way (PRoW), open space and the additional traffic. Physical activity and active travel forms an important part in helping to promote healthy weight environments and, as such, it is important that any changes have a positive long-term impact where possible.	Public Health England	Yes	All existing PRoW within the Scheme boundary are retained and will remain accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRoW during construction. The PRoWs would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRoW is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users. The Scheme proposes new permissive routes at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B.
Land use	The Footpath number 1 and the Ickneald Way will have a significant negative effect on the recreation and well-being of residents. These PRow are used both for connections with other areas (e.g. the footpath Icknield Way connecting to Newmarket. They are the only footpaths and bridleways leading to and from the village, as the roadways do not include footpaths. We do not agree that PRow which in many cases run along the edges of the development, or through areas that would be subject to development margins or setbacks, need to be closed for the full construction period, causing residents and visitors a significant loss of amenity. We believe that these issues mean that the proposal does	Snailwell Parish Council	Yes	All existing PRow within the Scheme boundary are retained and will remain accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRow would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst-case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users. The Scheme proposes new permissive routes at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	not give proper weight to amenity.			Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B.
Land use	The permissive path shown along a section of Beck Road would be welcome as a much-needed safe link between Sheldricks Road to the NW end and the public footpath at the SE end. However, a permissive path that only lasts for the lifetime of the scheme is of little value, and as a gesture of goodwill from the respective landowners to the community, we wish to see the path dedicated as a full public right of way, so that it may be a lasting legacy to the people of the area. Furthermore, we would like to see the route recorded as bridleway status as a minimum, so that cyclists and horse riders may benefit as well as those on foot. If such dedication is not possible, then as an alternative we would like to see Sunnica pay for a proper	West Row Parish Council	No	The Applicant is not able to provide dedicated PRow through the Scheme as the ability to create such rights is not contained within the Applicant's land agreements. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3]. The Applicant is proposing permissive routes for the duration of the Scheme's lifetime to provide additional recreational opportunities. The aim of this is to mitigate impacts caused by the construction and operation of the Scheme. Following the end of the Scheme's operating life and decommissioning, such impacts will no longer exist and therefore the accompanying mitigation through the permissive routes will no longer be required.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	path to be constructed along the side of the road in this location.			
Land use	With regards to the permissive path shown, as per our comments above we believe this should be dedicated as a permanent public right of way with bridleway status. We also note that at the Northern most point it ends at the scheme boundary, which does not join the public highway -and there is currently no public right of way between the end of the permissive path as shown and the highway, effectively making it a dead-end route. Is this intentional or an oversight, as it appears the landowner does own all the way up to the road?"	West Row Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has amended its proposals for permissive routes in light of feedback received during the statutory consultation. This was an error in the previous design. Further details of the permissive routes proposed can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Details are also provided in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant is not able to provide a dedicated PRoW through the Scheme as the ability to create such rights is not contained within the Applicant's land agreements. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3]. The Applicant is proposing permissive routes for the duration of the Scheme's lifetime to provide additional recreational opportunities. The aim of this is to mitigate impacts caused by the construction and operation of the Scheme. Following the end of the Scheme's operating life and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				decommissioning, such impacts will no longer exist, and therefore the accompanying mitigation through the permissive routes will no longer be required.
Land use	We object to this development, however, if significant mitigation in terms of improving rights of way be incorporated, then should the scheme be approved we would consider withdrawing our objection.	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has amended its proposals for permissive routes during the Scheme's operating life. The Applicant is not able to provide dedicated PRow through the Scheme as the ability to create such rights is not contained within the Applicant's land agreements. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3]. The Scheme proposes new permissive routes at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further details can be found in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	We would be seeking to provide access for the maximum number of users – it is morally, socially, economically and environmentally correct that public money is spent to benefit the maximum number of users as possible. So rather than footpaths, pedestrian underpasses and footbridges, we should be seeking access for cyclists, horse riders and the often forgotten carriage drivers as well, so restricted byways where possible and bridleways everywhere else.	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The final details of the Applicant's proposed permissive routes including width and maintenance will be agreed in the final design with the relevant local authority subject to the Applicant receiving development consent. Details of the Applicant's proposed permissive routes can be found in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	The Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP), which is a statutory document and forms part of the transport plan, states that the rights of way network in Cambridgeshire is fragmented, inadequate and in need of improvement.'	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is proposing to improve pedestrian access throughout the area by delivering a number of new permissive routes during the project's operating life. Details of these can be found in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Developments such as these should take every opportunity to improve the network particularly at this time when so many more people are accessing the countryside.			
Land use	The proposed permissive paths are not acceptable to SLAF. More mitigation is required and where possible permanent and not permissive routes.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	Yes	The Applicant has amended its proposals for permissive routes in light of feedback received during the statutory consultation. The proposed permissive routes are at Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further details of the permissive routes proposed can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Details are also provided in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant is not able to provide a dedicated PRow through the Scheme as

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the ability to create such rights is not contained within the Applicant's land agreements. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3]. The Applicant has not secured an agreement with the relevant landowners to enable the use of permissive paths by horse riders. The Applicant is proposing permissive routes for the duration of the Scheme's lifetime to provide additional recreational opportunities. The aim of this is to mitigate impacts caused by the construction and operation of the Scheme. Following the end of the Scheme's operating life and decommissioning, such impacts will no longer exist, and therefore the accompanying mitigation through the permissive routes will no longer be required.
Land use	CLAF would also like to raise the point that carriage drivers only have access to 2% of the PROW network. New/upgraded paths should be available to as many	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The final details of the Applicant's proposed permissive routes including width and maintenance will be agreed in the final design with the relevant local authority subject to the Applicant receiving development consent. Details of

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	users as possible so restricted byways which allow access for carriage drivers should be considered as a gold standard			the Applicant's proposed permissive routes can be found in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	We have concerns about fencing-in paths, especially against industrial equipment like solar panels, the transformers do make noises which detract from the amenity of the PRow.	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operation at a number of sensitive receptor locations in proximity to the Scheme. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An assessment of the effect interactions from visual effects and noise effects of the Scheme on PRow users has been undertaken and is included in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment also includes the potential impacts to journey time and human health for users of PRow. The assessment concluded no significant effects from effect interactions on the PRow network in the proximity of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. An Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) will be followed throughout operation to ensure that potential environmental effects during operation are avoided, mitigated and managed where necessary. A Framework OEMP has been submitted with the DCO in Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	We would like to see alternative PRoW's be created when existing paths are obstructed during construction. Construction access should not use the PROW network. There is guidance available from the BHS who have published an advice note on Solar Farms which will be of interest to you	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is not proposing to use PRoW for access but the access will cross the PRoW at certain points. These are identified within Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1]. During construction, some PRoW will need to be closed for up to three weeks. The Applicant has engaged with the British Horse Society while preparing its proposals and has had regard to the feedback received, as well as the guidance available from the BHS.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	A second issue could be to provide a better year round footpath from Snailwell to Chippenham Fen. The FP from grid ref 643679 running NE to the Fen is currently a complete quagmire and totally unusable. Some mitigation from the proposed Sunnica West B Farm would be to provide a new ROW along a permanent grass path on the eastern boundary of this site, to be continued around the Nature Reserve boundary to the current footpath where it enters the Reserve at grid ref 652692	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is not proposing to provide a better year round footpath from Snailwell to Chippenham Fen. The impacts of the Scheme on the PRoW network in the local area have been assessed and the effect is not deemed to be significant, such to require works to that path. The results of this assessment can be found within Chapter 12: Socio-economics and land use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Climate change	Will there be a NET CO2 benefit for this development if a more comprehensive and fair assessment were carried out that took into account loss of productive farmland, biodiversity, a potential increase in food miles and the installation of a significant amount of infrastructure to support and	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The lifecycle Greenhouse Gas(GHG) impact assessment undertaken by the Applicant, as presented in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], considers all GHG emissions arising over the lifecycle of the Scheme (including construction, operation and decommissioning), and has been carried out in accordance with the Institute of Environmental Management and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	reach the development? In an urban or industrial setting, it could be argued that the majority of infrastructure already exists in terms of supporting the solar panels on roofs and having easy access to the electricity grid.			Assessment (IEMA) guidance for assessing GHG emissions within Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant is of the view that the development can be described as sustainable. The Scheme is answering an urgent national need for forms of low carbon, renewable energy generation. The GHG intensity of the Scheme compares favourably with the projected grid GHG intensity, as well as with alternative energy generation types, and it is estimated that an additional 1,118,011 tCO₂e would be emitted to generate the equivalent amount of electricity over the operational lifetime of the Scheme from the projected grid energy mix. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate.
Climate change	CPRE is very conscious of the accelerating effects of climate change and the need	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Scheme has been designed to minimise the effect it will have on the environment including the countryside,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	for rapid change to a low carbon economy with using suitable sources of renewable energy. However, all such projects must be considered in terms of their true, life-time, environmental impact just as any other item of new infrastructure. This proposal is damaging to the countryside, to the landscape, to local heritage assets and to local communities in many ways and there is little evidence that alternative methods of providing the same levels of renewable energy or alternative, more sustainable, locations have been looked at meaningfully by the Applicant. To some extent we can understand this because current government policy towards renewable energy does not encourage wider thinking.			the landscape, local heritage assets and local communities. A full environmental impact assessment has been conducted which reports on the effects that the Scheme will have on the environment. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An analysis of potential alternative locations for the Scheme (including brownfield sites) was undertaken as included in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. The Applicant is of the view that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will not be a project that is "locked in time" but will rather generate a significant volume of renewable energy over the duration of its operating life. The Applicant has provided analysis within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] that sets out the benefits created by

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				larger, single, solar projects in being able to deliver low carbon electricity more quickly and at a lower cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same generating capacity.
Climate change	Formal carbon lifecycle analysis, CLA, should be used to prove that during their whole lifecycle; construction, operation, decommissioning and disposal/recycling; this installation will actually save more carbon emissions than it creates. The standard evaluation used is not a complete CLA. Without a robust carbon lifecycle analysis, the development cannot be said to be sustainable.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The lifecycle Greenhouse Gas(GHG) impact assessment undertaken by the Applicant, as presented in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], considers all GHG emissions arising over the lifecycle of the Scheme (including construction, operation and decommissioning), and has been carried out in accordance with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance for assessing GHG emissions within Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant is of the view that the development can be described as sustainable. The Scheme is answering an urgent national need for forms of low carbon, renewable energy generation. The GHG intensity of the Scheme compares favourably with the projected grid GHG intensity, as well as with alternative energy generation types, and it is estimated that an additional 1,118,011 tCO ₂ e would be emitted to generate the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				equivalent amount of electricity over the operational lifetime of the Scheme from the projected grid energy mix.
Climate change	What is the carbon footprint of the scheme?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The lifecycle Greenhouse Gas(GHG) impact assessment undertaken by the Applicant, as presented in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], considers all GHG emissions arising over the lifecycle of the Scheme (including construction, operation and decommissioning), and has been carried out in accordance with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance for assessing GHG emissions within Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant is of the view that the development can be described as sustainable. The Scheme is answering an urgent national need for forms of low carbon, renewable energy generation. The GHG intensity of the Scheme compares favourably with the projected grid GHG intensity, as well as with alternative energy generation types, and it is estimated that an additional 1,118,011 tCO₂e would be emitted to generate the equivalent amount of electricity over the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				operational lifetime of the Scheme from the projected grid energy mix.
Climate change	What is the environmental impact of the scheme; both during its lifespan and after the decommissioning of the solar panels and batteries?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has provided an assessment of environmental impacts within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] with the DCO Application which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. The creation of waste during decommissioning is considered in Chapter 16 of the Environmental [EN010106/APP/6.1] and so the effects of this has been considered in the Environmental Statement. Sunnica is committed to compliance with the waste hierarchy when decommissioning plant

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				used in the Scheme, and this includes both PV modules and batteries. Given that the Scheme is expected to operate for 40 years, it is not possible to say now exactly how decommissioning will take place and therefore Sunnica proposes to secure the provision of a DEMP, which will include a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan setting out how waste will be dealt with prior to the commencement of decommissioning. The framework DEMP includes proposals to ensure that waste disposal is carried out in accordance with the waste hierarchy and where waste disposal is unavoidable that it is responsibly disposed of.
Renewable energy	The solar electricity generated will be sold via Power Purchasing Agreements (PPA) to large Corporations and the National Grid's Balancing Mechanism, at premium rates.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is proposing that the Scheme will import and export electricity to the National Electricity Grid. This will be monetised at the optimal market rate. Solar energy generation is economically efficient and is economically attractive in Great Britain against many other forms of conventional and renewable generation. The proposed Scheme would provide an important role in helping meet the urgent

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				national need for new means of renewable energy generation. The battery storage element of the Scheme will provide a complementary suite of services to the PV module element. These services will include a crucial grid balancing role. Further information on this is provided in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Renewable energy	The unpalatable truth is that Sunnica will be storing energy in vast banks of batteries to sell to the National Grid at premium rates. Sunnica has also not clarified if they will be using the batteries installed at Burwell to buy and store electricity from the Grid at cheap times of the day to then sell it back to the grid at premium times. If this is the case, it is as we suspected all along, a commodity trading business being allowed to slip through under the green umbrella. Sunnica has already admitted that they will be making provision for extra battery capacity	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is proposing the Scheme in response to the urgent national need for new, renewable, forms of energy generation. The battery storage element of the Scheme will provide a complementary suite of services to the PV module element. These services will include a crucial grid balancing role. Further information on this is provided in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant has provided details of the maximum parameters and design principles of the BESS where an area has been designated for the location of the BESS together with details of the maximum parameters and design principles of the BESS structures. More information can be found on this in Chapter 3 - Scheme Description of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	over and above what is shown on the scheme to date.			Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Renewable energy	Other, local smaller scale solar developments have been implemented over time and carry less risk from a technological standpoint, since advances in panel design and associated infrastructure are naturally taken into account. Compare this to Sunnica being a single scheme "locked in time" at the point of construction.	Freckenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is of the view that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will not be a project that is "locked in time" but will rather generate a significant volume of renewable energy over the duration of its operating life. The Applicant has provided analysis within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] that sets out the benefits created by larger, single, solar projects in being able to deliver low carbon electricity more quickly and at a lower cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same generating capacity. The Applicant notes the importance of incorporating suitable flexibility within its proposed DCO and is doing so to ensure that it is able to take advantage of advances in technology to maximise the benefits of the proposed Scheme during its operating life. This flexibility will

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				however be within the parameters assessed as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Renewable energy	Within a 15 mile radius of Isleham/Freckenham/Worlington/Snailwell/Chippenham there are 11 large solar farms in operation (all, except for one, of these is on highly productive agricultural land) covering an area of nearly 1200 acres and generating an output of over 265 MW. A further 7 large solar farms are currently in the process of being built within this same 15 mile radius (5 awaiting construction, 2 are under review). These will cover an additional area of over 860 acres and will generate a further 188 MW electricity. So the solar farms that are currently in place/in process within 15 miles of these villages already cover a vast	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has included a summary of cumulative effects (including other solar farms) in Chapter 17: Effect Interactions of the Environmental Statement EN010106/APP/6.1]. It is the Applicant's view that the proposed Scheme is not an alternative to other solar projects a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The Applicant has provided analysis within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] that sets out the benefits created by larger, single, solar projects in being able to deliver low carbon electricity more quickly and at a lower cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same generating capacity. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Applicant has sought to avoid

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	area (over 2000 acres, output over 450 MW). In addition to these solar farms within a 15 mile radius, there is a wind farm (29 MW output), 5 biodigester plants and 2 landfill gas sites. So within this small radius, we are very much 'doing our bit' to embrace renewable energy technologies. Not to mention the many other excellent initiatives that are taking place locally such as solar panels being fitted on domestic and commercial properties, solar car ports being built on large car parks in this region, and the new evolving technologies of solar 'cloths,' solar tiles etc. that are also emerging. There are likely to be other solar farm proposals (farm diversification projects) in the pipeline too. We cannot keep clearing vast areas of valuable arable			using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A: Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	farmland without suffering the consequences in years to come.			
Renewable energy	The scale of the project means it is less efficient than smaller projects because of the embedded carbon in cables, concrete, battery storage and losses when compared with say urban solar when the distance between supply and use is much smaller and no farmland is lost.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is of the view that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will generate a significant volume of renewable energy over the duration of its operating life. The Applicant has provided analysis within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] that sets out the benefits created by larger, single, solar projects in being able to deliver low carbon electricity more quickly and at a lower cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same generating capacity.
Renewable energy	Continually changing feed in tariffs, government regulations and policies and the fact that the operator is unknown all cast doubt over the financial viability of such a project, it becoming unprofitable and ultimately	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant considers that the Scheme is financially viable. The Applicant has produced a Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] as part of its DCO application which demonstrates how it will fund the liabilities it will incur as part of the implementation of the Scheme. The decommissioning and removal of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	failing, leaving a huge detrimental legacy for our community.			proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will be secured at the end of its lifetime through the requirements of the DCO. A framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan has been submitted with the application which provides additional details of the decommissioning process. The Applicant will be required to submit a more detailed Decommissioning and Environmental Management Plan at the end of the lifetime of the Scheme. The proposed requirement to secure this is included in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1].
Renewable energy	Renewable technology is developing fast and this scheme in its current form will quite quickly become obsolete so why lose massive areas of farmland and commit for such a long-time span. Please explain.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant considers that the Scheme is financially viable and disagrees that the Scheme 'will quickly become obsolete'. Within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] the Applicant has set out that solar is both economically efficient and that solar projects of the scale proposed are able to bring forward carbon reduction and economic benefits in line with government policy. The GHG intensity of the Scheme compares favourably with the projected grid GHG intensity, as well as with alternative energy generation types, and it is estimated that an additional 1,118,011 tCO ₂ e would be emitted to generate the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				equivalent amount of electricity over the operational lifetime of the Scheme from the projected grid energy mix. The Applicant recognises that is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of conserving the national resource of agricultural use against the benefits of renewable energy generation.
Renewable energy	Solar power does not compare well with other forms of renewal energy due to amount of land needed for it to be effective. The UK's climate does not have consistent and high levels of sunlight. Large Solar schemes such as the Sunnica proposal are suitable for desert environments, not rural English villages.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the relevance of the project in the context of the need for new renewable energy generation more widely. This includes details of why solar energy generation is efficient and suitable in Great Britain, including when compared against many other forms of conventional and renewable energy generation. As set out in the Statement of Need, solar projects of this scale bring important benefits in helping the country to meet its legal commitment to decarbonise, especially within the important 2020s timeframe. The UK has a number of locations with suitable irradiation for solar farms, Figure 7-1 within the Statement of Need shows that the proposed location

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				for the Scheme is within one of the higher solar irradiation areas of the UK.
Renewable energy	As per the government's statement on 6th October 2020, their priority for green energy is now focussed on wind farms and they have pledged £160m towards this initiative. This is a change of government policy since the Sunnica scheme was announced. Why therefore is the application being allowed to continue without being backed up with robust figures?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to wind powered energy generation but will compliment such forms of generation in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the relevance of the project in the context of the need for new renewable energy generation more widely. The Applicant considers the Statement of Need to provides a robust summary of the benefits of the proposed Scheme and solar generation and storage more widely. The GHG intensity of the Scheme compares favourably with the projected grid GHG intensity, as well as with alternative energy generation types, and it is estimated that an additional 1,118,011 tCO₂e would be emitted to generate the equivalent amount of electricity over the operational lifetime of the Scheme from the projected grid energy mix. Further information is provided in Chapter 6

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Renewable energy	The Prime Minister recently supported the NPF view that wind generated energy is the most efficient form of renewable energy and that “the UK will become the wind power capital of the world by 2030”. We understand that a relatively small number of offshore wind-powered turbines would produce the equivalent amount of energy but without the long-term detrimental effect on the rural environment.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to wind powered energy generation but will compliment such forms of generation in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the relevance of the project in the context of the need for new renewable energy generation more widely. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including alternative technologies, can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Renewable energy	Due to the relatively rapid decarbonisation of the grid the impact of a scheme such as this is much smaller than say five years ago – maybe halved.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant does not consider the need for the proposed Scheme to have been reduced by wider decarbonisation. Within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1], the Applicant notes that decarbonisation is a UK legal requirement and is of global significance.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				It cannot be allowed to fail, and urgent actions are required in the UK and abroad, to keep decarbonisation on track to limit global warming. Single large-scale solar schemes such as the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm are able to deliver more quickly and at a lower unit cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same total capacity, bringing forward carbon reduction and economic benefits in line with government policy.
Renewable energy	Solar panels degrade slightly each year and so inherently become less efficient. Over a period of 30-40 years of operating life, they will produce a small fraction of the original output, and so the scheme will become uneconomic well before the end of the proposed period. The solar panels being proposed are unknown technology, they are bigger and already less productive than more up to date technology variants.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant notes that photovoltaic (PV) modules do indeed degrade every year. This is estimated to be 0.5% which results in a lower level of production over a period of 30 - 40 years. Assuming the accuracy of this figure, the Scheme will be producing at 80% of its original operating efficiency by the end of its 40-year operating life. During the Scheme's operating life, the operator may replace modules where degradation is such that they are no longer viable. However, the Applicant has assessed this level of degradation and continues to consider that the project is economically viable.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	There is a need to embrace other evolving technologies such as solar cloths and ground source heat systems.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is of the view that the project is not an alternative to other methods of renewable energy generation but will compliment such methods in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Sunnica Energy Farm in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely.
Renewable energy	Rather than being used on agricultural land such as this Scheme, solar should be installed on housing and commercial properties, and be focussed on brownfield sites. The Solar Trade Association for example states that there are 617,000 acres of south-facing commercial rooftops that are not yet being utilised in the UK for solar power. This could provide 50% of the UK's electricity need. Government guidelines	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely. Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land when selecting the Order land which is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	recommend the use of brownfield sites. Sunnica has not included or even considered any brownfield sites within this scheme. For example, there have been numerous closures of local military sites and there is some question mark over the future of RAF Mildenhall. Any number of these sites would be much more appropriate for solar farms than the use of agricultural land.			discussed in the Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2], however previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found.
Planning	The NPPF considers that renewable energy projects should be part of the Local Plan process, should not cause cumulative landscape or visual effects and that the only acceptable projects which are outside of Local Plan boundaries should be those supported by communities through the neighbourhood planning process. Clearly this proposal satisfies none of these criteria.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the policies of the NPPF in the preparation of its DCO application. The weight given to the NPPF policies in the context of the Scheme being a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is discussed in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application. An assessment of cumulative impact has been undertaken by the Applicant. These are included in each of the technical chapters (Chapters 6 to 16) and summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This includes details of all the planning applications that

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				have been submitted or accepted within the proximity of the Scheme. Chapter 17 includes consideration of intra-project cumulative effects (or effect interactions), where the assessment from multiple topics have been found to affect a single receptor. This assessment concluded that the effect interactions for all receptors would not increase the significance of the effects anticipated as a result of the single topics assessed for the single receptor.
Planning	The Alternatives site analysis in the PEIR Chapter 4 is incomplete. It contains no information about other sites considered within the 15km radius of the National Grid at Burwell. Together with comments made during Sunnica webinars about energy being taken from the grid and returned at different times ("energy trading"), we are unsure if this scheme is really about solar after all, or if it relies so heavily on energy trading using the battery storage element that	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The alternatives chapter of the PEIR presented an overview of the methodology for site selection and the key reasons for selecting land for the Scheme. The information presented was appropriate for the statutory consultation. Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides the detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites within the 15km study area for the Scheme. Chapter 4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides a summary. The Applicant is proposing the Scheme in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	it might be better sited closer to a grid connection point.			response to the urgent national need for new, renewable, forms of energy generation. The battery storage element of the Scheme will provide a complementary suite of services to the PV module element. These services will include a crucial grid balancing role. Further information on this is provided in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Planning	We believe that the proposal scheme does not give appropriate weight to environmental impact, as described in Principle number three in UK Solar PV Strategy Part 1: Roadmap to a Brighter Future. It also goes against point 1 of the planning considerations laid out in the Guidance on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. We believe that the proposed scheme also contravenes Forest Heath District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2001-2026 policy CS2 Natural Environment and West	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has given significant weight to environmental impact as described in Point 1 of the Guidance on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and has carried out a full environmental impact assessment. This is summarised in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the associated figures [EN010106/APP/6.3] and Appendices [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The significant adverse effects of the Scheme identified by this assessment have been mitigated where possible through changes to the Scheme design. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for selecting land for the Scheme and is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Suffolk Council Joint Development Management policy DM10 Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance.			Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to the environmental constraints of the land. The Applicant has considered the policies of the NPPF and other relevant national and local planning policies in preparing this DCO application. The Applicant's assessment of the Scheme against relevant planning policy (including local policy) is provided in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. The planning balance presented in the Planning Statement considers the environmental impact of the Scheme against the benefits of the Scheme.
Planning	The proposals are contrary to East Cambs Policy ENV1: Landscape and settlement character which states 'Development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and where possible enhance:	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the policies of East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 in preparing its DCO application, including policy ENV1. The Applicant's assessment of the Scheme against relevant planning policy is provided in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. The Applicant considers that the Scheme as submitted complies with the policy for the reasons set out below.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	a. The pattern of distinctive landscape features, such as watercourses, characteristic vegetation, woodland, trees, field patterns, hedges and walls, and their function as ecological corridors for wildlife dispersal b. The settlement edge, space between settlements, and their wider landscape setting c. Visually sensitive skylines, hillsides and geological features d. The unspoilt nature and tranquillity of the area e. Nocturnal character' and further fail to address the impact that is covered in East Cambs Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Renewable Energy Development at section 9 'Site restoration and			Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1] outlines the relevant landscape character assessments and related studies at national, regional, county and neighbourhood levels. Appendix 10D of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out the relevant matters of these published assessments in detail, including the character areas defined in the Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines. The Scheme is the result of an iterative design development process which addresses the key opportunities and challenges of the Scheme and the context and setting within which it is located, including its landscape character. Mitigation has been provided, to ensure that landscape impacts are minimised and significant adverse effects for landscape and visual amenity are avoided where possible to the wider area. Hedgerows have been retained and are enhanced where practicable and where temporary removal is required to facilitate construction of the Grid Connection Routes, these will be reinstated. Chapter 8, Ecology, of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], assesses the impact of the Scheme on wildlife. Key

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	continuation of agricultural use'.			views into and out of settlements, as detailed in the policy, will not be affected. As detailed in Section 12.7 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], appropriate measures to mitigate temporary impacts on users of PRowS during the construction and decommissioning phases have been proposed. The temporary closures will be supported by clear signs and where possible will be planned and programmed to minimise disruption to users. The Scheme therefore will minimise disruption in terms of public amenity and access. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 and is included in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Once the Scheme has been decommissioned and its infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production.
Planning	Sunnica estimate that there will 841 staff vehicles and 160 HGV movements a day. This is unacceptable in a	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the policies of East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 in preparing its DCO application, including policy COM7. The Applicant considers

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	rural area and contrary to Com 7 – Policy COM 7: Transport Impact Development should be designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and should promote and enhance sustainable forms of transport appropriate to its particular location. Opportunities should be maximised for increased permeability and connectivity to existing networks. Development proposals shall: a. Provide safe and convenient access to the highway network. b. Provide a comprehensive network of routes giving priority for walking and cycling. c. Protect existing rights of way or allow for agreed diversions in exceptional circumstances.			that the Scheme as submitted complies with the policy for the reasons set out below. Appendix 13B: Transport Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] contains a transport assessment. As outlined in Appendix 13A: Relevant Legislation and Policy of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2], this utilises the March 2014 Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements guidance produced by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. As detailed in Appendix 13B: Transport Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, there are no issues of highway safety arising as a result of the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Scheme. Overall the Scheme will enhance the PROW network. As detailed in Section 12.7 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], appropriate measures to mitigate temporary impacts on users of PROWs during the construction and decommissioning phases have been proposed. The temporary closures will be supported by

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	d. Consider the travel and transport needs of people with disabilities. e. Accommodate the efficient delivery of goods, supplies and services. f. Be capable of accommodating the level/type of traffic generated without detriment to the local highway network and the amenity, character or appearance of the locality. g. Be accompanied by a Transport Statement where appropriate; or if the proposals are likely to result in significant transport implications, be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. The coverage and detail of this should reflect the scale of development and the extent of the transport implications. h. Be accompanied by a Travel Plan for residential			clear signs and where possible will be planned and programmed to minimise disruption to users. Appendix 13C: Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] incorporates a framework travel plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	schemes of 50 or more dwellings or those which and are likely to generate significant amounts of traffic; and non-residential developments that are likely to generate significant amounts of traffic; and Within (g) and (h) indicate any steps to mitigate impacts relating to noise, pollution, amenity, health, safety and traffic.			
Planning	There is insufficient information about how this scheme will achieve a net biodiversity gain. Please can more detail be provided - ENV 7 of the ECDC Local plan states that – ‘All development proposals will be required to: Protect the biodiversity and geological value of land and buildings and minimise harm to or loss of environmental features, such as trees,	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the policies of East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 in preparing its DCO application, including policy ENV7. The Applicant considers that the Scheme as submitted complies with the policy for the reasons set out below. A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment, using Defra's Metric 3.0, has been provided in Appendix 8N of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. For the purposes of BNG, the Scheme will result in an overall net gain of approximately 83.51% habitat units, approximately 16.87% hedgerow units and approximately 1.98% of river units for biodiversity. The Scheme

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	hedgerows, woodland, wetland and ponds. Provide appropriate mitigation measures, reinstatement or replacement of features and/or compensatory work that will enhance or recreate habitats on or off site where harm to environmental features and habitat is unavoidable; and Maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats as an integral part of development proposals.			therefore promotes habitat creation and is supported by this part of the policy. Embedded design mitigation measures of the kind set out in this policy are outlined in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and described in further detail within the OLEMP (Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2], Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]), Framework OEMP (Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]), Framework DEMP (Appendix 16E of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The Tree Constraints Report in Appendix 10B of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Figure 10-3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] identifies no ancient woodland or veteran trees within the Order limits. Prior to construction a detailed tree survey will be undertaken to confirm the status of trees affected by the Scheme. The CEMP, to be secured through a requirement of the DCO, will include specific tree protection measures to be implemented, including fencing and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				construction exclusion zones. As outlined in Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], all woodland present within the Order limits will be retained and measures embedded within the Scheme design to protect retained habitats during construction, such as that security fencing will be established at an early stage to protect retained habitats from incursion during construction. There will be no direct loss of woodland habitat. Section 8.6 of Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] identifies six internationally designated ecological sites within 10km of the Scheme, namely: Fenland Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA); Wicken Fen Ramsar and Wicken Fen NNR; Rex Graham Reserve SAC; Breckland SAC; and Devil's Dyke SAC.
Planning	ECDC SPD on Renewable Energy states at 9.5 'Where it is proposed to develop a solar farm on a greenfield site applicants will be expected to provide the following information as part of the planning application:	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The proposed Scheme is classified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The Applicant is therefore making an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) and not a planning application to East Cambridgeshire District Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	The amount of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) which will be developed as part of the application Alternative sites which have been considered including the agricultural or environmental value of these sites and why these have been discounted To what extent the proposed site will remain in agricultural use following development How the site is intended to be restored to agricultural use. There is a lack of information provided by Sunnica in order to satisfy concerns on all of the above points			The Applicant has provided details related to all of the points identified within its DCO application: The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. Full details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. Further information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites, including brownfield sites, can be found in Appendix 4A Alternatives Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				2008 and is included in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use, anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or DCO application, in the same way as housing or industrial uses require this consent now. The Applicant has submitted a Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] with the DCO Application which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.
Planning	The proposed Scheme contravenes the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 contains Policy ENV 6: Renewable energy development. This proposal	Fordham Parish Council, Chippenham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the policies of East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 in preparing its DCO application. The Applicant's assessment of the Scheme against relevant planning policy is provided in the Planning Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	will have significant adverse effects that cannot be mediated and made acceptable in relation to several different aspects.			[EN010106/APP/7.2]. The Applicant has carried out a full EIA which is summarised in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the associated figures [EN010106/APP/6.3] and appendices [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The significant adverse effects of the Scheme identified by this assessment have been mitigated where possible. The Scheme meets the established urgent need for nationally significant renewable energy infrastructure set out in national policy by providing large amounts of low carbon energy quickly. Overall, with appropriate mitigation implemented, the EIA identifies limited residual significant adverse effects of the Scheme during its 40 year operation when considered relative to the large scale nature of the Scheme. These effects are therefore considered to be outweighed by the significant national benefits that the Scheme will provide by providing much needed large scale renewable energy generation. The Scheme is therefore considered to be in accordance with the relevant national and local policies relating to the need for and provision of

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				renewable energy infrastructure, including East Cambridgeshire's Local Plan 2015 Policy ENV 6. The planning balance presented in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] considers the environmental impact of the Scheme against the benefits of the Scheme.
Planning	The Sunnica proposal fails to address all aspects of Guiding Principle number three UK Solar PV Strategy Part 1: Roadmap to a Brighter Future, "Support for solar PV should ensure proposals are appropriately sited, give proper weight to environmental considerations such as landscape and visual impact, heritage and local amenity, and provide opportunities for local communities to influence decisions that affect them." and also the 9 points on how to avoid a "negative impact on the rural environment, particularly in undulating landscapes" from	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has given significant weight to environmental impact in developing its Scheme design and has carried out a full environmental impact assessment. This is summarised in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the associated figures [EN010106/APP/6.3] and appendices [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The significant adverse effects of the Scheme identified by this assessment have been mitigated where possible through changes to the Scheme design. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for selecting land for the Scheme and is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the Guidance on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy.			reference to the environmental constraints of the land. The Applicant has considered the policies of the NPPF and other relevant national and local planning policies in preparing this DCO application. The Applicant's assessment of the Scheme against relevant planning policy (including local policy) is provided in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. The planning balance presented in the Planning Statement considers the environmental impact of the Scheme against the benefits of the Scheme.
Design	Barton Mills Parish Council object to the Sunnica Proposal and support objections to the scheme. This decision is based on the size of the proposed scheme, which the Parish Council believe is far too large.	Barton Mills Parish Council	Yes	The need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size. In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has made a number of design changes, which have resulted in the total developable area of the project (the area where the infrastructure for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will be located: PV module, battery energy storage, and cabling) being reduced. Further information on this

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	This scheme will be three times bigger than any other scheme in the UK. Why does it have to be so big?	Chippenham Parish Council	Yes	The need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size. In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has made a number of design changes, which have resulted in the total developable area of the project (the area where the infrastructure for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will be located: PV module, battery energy storage, and cabling) being reduced. Further information on this is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	The huge size of the scheme leads to its own significant issues with siting for the project overall. The search for unusually large parcels of land has led the scheme to	Freckenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has given significant consideration to the siting of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant has sought to use land that is not considered to be 'best and most versatile' (agricultural land classification grades 1, 2

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	base itself well away from the high-capacity connection point to the National Grid at Burwell. Smaller schemes do not encounter this issue, connection to the local grid is possible, and much less substation equipment is required as the supply doesn't need to be "stepped up" to the very high voltages used on the National Grid. Losses increase given the approximately 15 miles of cable between East A and the substation at Burwell, and the additional equipment required.			and 3a). This has been a key consideration in choosing the location for the project. Proximity to the grid connection is also an important consideration and the land proposed for inclusion within the Order Limits is considered to be appropriate for solar and battery storage development, being within a 15km radius of the Burwell National Grid Substation. The Applicant considered the potential for energy loss at a 15km radius during the design process and considers the project to be viable. Further details of how the Applicant has chosen the location of the project can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is proposing a project of this size to meet a national need for new forms of renewable energy generation. This requires that new forms of energy generation come forward to connect to the national electricity grid. As the United Kingdom is aiming to meet its net zero climate obligations and to replace older forms of energy generation, projects of this kind are required to provide clean

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				forms of energy generation to the national electricity grid. Further details of the need for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm are provided in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Design	The Scheme is only the size it is to justify the cost of the cable length from the fields of solar panels and battery storage containers to Burwell substation. This point alone suggests that the scheme is flawed in its concept.	Chippenham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size. In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has made a number of design changes, which have resulted in the total developable area of the project (the area where the infrastructure for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will be located: PV modules, battery energy storage, and cabling) being reduced. Further information on this is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	The Sunnica team has denied the possibility of the proposed underground transmission cables from Burwell to the solar	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is proposing to use underground cabling to connect the Scheme sites to the Burwell National Grid Substation as set out in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	development (it's not a 'farm') being changed to overhead transmission lines. However, when subjected to the cold hard realities of 'value engineering' at some later point in the process, we are concerned this preferred method may not be enforced due to the substantial cost differentials involved not to mention the inevitable construction difficulties that will be encountered especially when passing through Chippenham Fen. Underground cables can be at least three times more expensive than overhead lines and if active cooling methods are required the cost could be as high as ten times as much. We accept there will be significant disruption during the burying of the cables but, once placed, the maintenance and visual impact will be negligible when compared to overhead lines. A commitment to underground			[EN010106/APP/6.1]. This is reflected in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] for which the applicant seeks development consent. If the Applicant were to receive consent, it would be required to develop according to the conditions of its Development Consent Order (DCO).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	cables should be imposed by law in any agreement for this project to avoid the possibility of a contractor reneging on this promise.			
Design	It would also be interesting to see what the level of power loss/voltage drop is expected to be over the considerable length of underground cable required to reach the development(s) and what the transmission voltage will be running beneath our feet and if that poses any safety concerns that cannot easily be mitigated.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for energy loss during the transport of energy to the connection point with the national transmission and regional distribution networks. The project has been designed in such a way as to maximise the use of its grid connection. This accounts for potential energy loss and is industry standard practice. Having considered the potential loss of energy during transmission, the Applicant continues to consider that the Scheme is viable. The Applicant has considered the impact of electromagnetic fields and consulted with Public Health England at the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping stage. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of our Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and this approach was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				proposed Sunnica Energy Farm did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England did not raise a concern with this approach when consulted on the scoping report. The high voltage cables associated with the Scheme have been sited within agricultural fields and away from residential areas where residents would be exposed. Therefore, it is considered that EMFs will not have a public health impact.
Design	We are also concerned about the reference to "securing" mitigation sites in Appendix 10i section 7.2.24, does this mean compulsory purchase of further land outside the red line boundary in an attempt to avoid the noise and disruption effects of the two-year construction period?	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The land proposed for use by the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm (the Order Limits) is set out in the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3] and the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1]. The Applicant is not seeking to compulsorily acquire additional land to that which is set out in the Book of Reference and shown on the Land Plans [EN010106/APP/2.1]. It is the Applicant's preference, where possible, to enter into voluntary agreements for the land included within the Order Limits. If it is not possible to come to such agreements, the Applicant

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				may seek to use compulsory purchase powers, as provided for by the Planning Act 2008.
Design	The BESS and Substation shown at E33 are very close to the road and would be very unsightly and highly visible. If this site goes ahead, we strongly believe that they should be relocated elsewhere within the site, potentially behind the existing reservoirs, to minimise their impact on the views from the public highway. We strongly object to their current placement within the site.	West Row Parish Council	Yes	In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has revised the Scheme design to provide additional mitigation to views into parcel E33 from Ferry Lane. This revised layout can be viewed in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Further information is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	We are strongly opposed to the field labelled as E07 being used for solar panels. The vast majority of the solar panels on this site are all to the North of Beck Road, and this is the only group to the South. When travelling along Beck Road, the views to the North will be transformed from the current agricultural	West Row Parish Council	Yes	In response to the feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has revised its design and will not be locating PV modules on parcel E07. This area now forms ECO2, as shown in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Further information is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	one to that of an enormous solar farm. It would be nice to at least be able to look to the South side of the road and not have the countryside views blighted in the same way. By using field E07 for solar panels, the views on this side from all directions will be spoiled. Therefore we would urge Sunnica to either remove those panels from the scheme entirely, or, as a reasonable compromise, to move them to another field adjoining the remainder of the site to the North of Beck Road.			Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	In respect of existing Cadent infrastructure, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus, Cadent Infrastructure within or in close proximity to the development Cadent has	Cadent Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with Cadent Gas following the statutory consultation and has incorporated features to manage any construction and operations impacts on Cadent Gas' assets from the Scheme and negotiations on protective provisions are ongoing. The Applicant is aiming to conclude agreements with Cadent Gas to ensure suitable provision for Cadent Gas' assets and operations.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	identified the following apparatus within the vicinity of the proposed works: ▪High Pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment ▪Intermediate Pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment ▪Above Ground Installation (AGI)			
Design	Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require adequate notice and discussions should be started at the earliest opportunity. Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require the party requesting the diversion works to obtain any necessary planning permissions and other consents to enable the diversion works to be carried out. Details of these consents should be agreed	Cadent Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with Cadent Gas following the statutory consultation and has incorporated features to manage any construction and operations impacts on Cadent Gas' assets from the Scheme and negotiations on protective provisions are ongoing. The Applicant is aiming to conclude agreements with Cadent Gas to ensure suitable provision for Cadent Gas' assets and operations.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	in writing with Cadent before any applications are made. Cadent would ordinarily require a minimum of C4/Conceptual Design study to have been carried out to establish an appropriate diversion route ahead of any application being made. Where diversions sit outside the highway boundary the party requesting the diversion will be responsible for obtaining at their cost and granting to Cadent the necessary land rights, on Cadent's standard terms, to allow the construction, maintenance and access of the diverted apparatus. As such adequate landrights must be granted to Cadent (e.g. following the exercise of compulsory powers to acquire such rights included within the DCO) to enable works to proceed, to Cadent's satisfaction. Cadent's approval to the land rights powers included in the DCO prior to submission is			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	strongly recommended to avoid later substantive objection to the DCO. Land rights will be required to be obtained prior to construction and commissioning of any diverted apparatus, in order to avoid any delays to the project's timescales. A diversion agreement may be required addressing responsibility for works, timescales, expenses and indemnity.			
Design	Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. Operations within Cadent's existing easement strips are not permitted without approval and will necessitate a Deed of	Cadent Gas	Yes	The Applicant has further engaged with Cadent Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude agreements with Cadent Gas to ensure suitable provision for Cadent Gas' operations. Discussions in relation to protective provisions are ongoing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Consent or Crossing Agreement being put in place. Any proposals for work in the vicinity for Cadent's existing apparatus will require approval by Plant Protection under the Protective Provisions/Asset Protection Agreement and early discussions are advised.			
Design	Cadent has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip. Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the Cadent easement strip and a Crossing Agreement may be required if any apparatus needs to cross the Cadent easement strip. Cadent's general notes on	Cadent Gas	Yes	The Applicant has further engaged with Cadent Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude agreements to ensure suitable protective provisions for Cadent Gas' operations. The Applicant will continue to engage with Cadent Gas subject to receiving development consent and preparing its final project design and during construction and operations.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	pipeline safety should be adhered to.			
Design	You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and Cadent's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Cadent High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations -requirements for third parties GD/SP/SSW22. Digsafe leaflet Excavating Safely - Avoiding injury when working near gas pipes. There will be additional requirements dictated by Cadent's plant protection team.	Cadent Gas	Yes	The Applicant notes the guidance outlined in this response and has incorporated measures into the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2]. The Applicant is aiming to conclude agreements with Cadent Gas to ensure suitable provision for Cadent Gas' assets and operations.
Design	We recommend that the applicant should: 1. Refer to our Groundwater Protection webpages, which include the Groundwater Protection Position Statements	Environment Agency	Yes	The Applicant notes the guidance outlined in this response. The Applicant is aiming to conclude agreements with Cadent Gas to ensure suitable provision for Cadent Gas' assets and operations.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	2. Follow the Land Contamination: Risk Management guidance when dealing with land affected by contamination 3. Refer to the CL:AIRE Water and Land Library (WALL) and the Guiding Principles for Land Contamination for the type of information that required in order to assess risks to controlled waters. 4. Refer to our Land Contamination Technical Guidance 5. Refer to Position Statement on the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice 6. Refer to British Standards BS 5930:1999 A2:2010 Code of practice for site investigations and BS10175:2011 A1: 2013 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites – code of practice 7. Refer to guidance in Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Land Affected by Contamination and Piling Into Contaminated Sites 8. Refer to our Good Practice for Decommissioning Boreholes and Wells 9. Refer to our Dewatering building sites and other excavations: environmental permits guidance when temporary dewatering is proposed.			
Design	Cadent will also need to ensure that our pipelines remain accessible throughout and after completion of the works.	Cadent Gas	Yes	The Applicant has further engaged with Cadent Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and aims to conclude agreements with Cadent Gas to ensure suitable provision for Cadent Gas' operations.
Design	We deem the proposed layout to be nothing more than an opportunistic, 'hotch-potch' design, based on the availability of land (and greed of local landowners) rather than efficient energy production. This proposal would result in: panels littering the countryside across four sites,	Isleham Parish Council	No	In developing its proposals, the Applicant has given consideration both to the need for efficient energy generation and the importance of adhering to policies contained within the NPPF that seek to minimise use of 'best and most versatile' agricultural land. The Applicant considers that the project design to be an appropriate balance between these considerations. The Applicant considers that 96.2% of the proposed Sunnica

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the need for the cutting of a 2m deep x15 milelong pipeline to link the four sites to the proposed connection point at Burwell. The grid connection would cut through the local countryside, criss-crossing many roads, railway, rivers, streams pathways and public rights of way, compounding the destruction of the local countryside and result in the loss of a considerable amount of generated electricity.			Energy Farm is sited on land that is not considered to be 'best and most versatile'. The Applicant's proposals for the project design have evolved through engagement with stakeholders across two rounds of public consultation and in response to the results of its environmental surveys. Further information can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme has been designed to minimise the effect it will have on the countryside. The Scheme has sought to avoid ecological features and sites designated for nature conservation. Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impacts on ecology receptors and conclude there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. In addition, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual receptors and sought to reduce the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				potential effects of the Scheme through mitigation embedded within the Scheme design.
Design	Fields surrounding Burwell are better in terms of Geographical locality and also topography.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large scale solar farm. This has considered land within a 15km search area from the point of connection at Burwell National Grid Substation. Details of the process are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Design	National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines and substations within or in close proximity to the scoping area/proposed order limits. This includes the following: Burwell Main 400kV substation Burwell Main 132 kV substation	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas. Through these discussions, the Applicant aims to conclude agreements with National Grid to ensure adequate provision for existing electricity transmission infrastructure.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	4ZM (400kV) overhead line (Burwell Main to Walpole 1) (Burwell Main to Walpole 2) The Applicant should adhere to National Grid's guidance on development near electricity overhead transmission lines. National Grid's Overhead Line is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset. Hence we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with National Grid prior to any works taking place.			
Design	Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has noted this response and has further developed the project design to ensure adequate clearances.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines.			
Design	If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines, then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has noted this response and has further developed the project design to ensure adequate clearances.
Design	Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has noted this response and has further developed the project design to ensure no changes to ground levels above underground cables. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas. Through these discussions, the Applicant aims to conclude agreements with National Grid to ensure adequate provision for existing electricity transmission infrastructure

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	and construction being implemented.			
Design	National Grid Gas has high pressure gas transmission pipeline located within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits. Feeder Main 3 – Roudham Heath to Great Wilbraham, Barton Mills to Burwell. National Grid has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. National Grid will also need to ensure that our pipelines access is maintained during and after construction.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has noted this response and has amended the Scheme design to ensure adequate provision for National Grid Gas' easements. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid Gas. Through these discussions, the Applicant is aiming to conclude agreements with National Grid Gas to ensure adequate provision for existing gas transmission infrastructure.
Design	Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a National	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has noted this response and has continued to engage with National Grid Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Through these discussions, the Applicant is aiming to conclude agreements with National Grid Gas to ensure adequate

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Grid representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.			provision for existing gas transmission infrastructure.
Design	The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required.	National Grid/National Grid	Yes	The Applicant has noted this response and has continued to engage with National Grid following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Through these discussions, the Applicant is aiming to conclude agreements with National Grid to ensure adequate provision for existing gas transmission infrastructure.
Design	The Power industry accepted losses involved with transmission and distribution to delivered electricity has not been addressed. Losses on average over 20% are incurred from generator to consumer. Sunnica will lose a further 20% on 'turnaround losses' charging and then discharging their batteries and then a further 20% loss delivering the electricity to the end user.	Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for energy loss during the transport of energy to the connection point with the national transmission and regional distribution networks. The project has been designed in such a way as to maximise the use of its grid connection. This accounts for potential energy loss and is industry standard practice. Having considered the potential loss of energy during transmission, the Applicant continues to consider that the Scheme is viable.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The Solar PV output ratings are predicated on a 25-degree Celsius ambient temperature and light path perpendicular to the panel. This will not normally be achievable at the Sunnica site and any reduction in the angle of the light path and temperature will significantly reduce the output. In winter months the sun will not illuminate panels behind the most southerly sited row because they will be shaded by the row in front.	Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered both the suitability of the site and the constraints presented by the site as part of its design for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant is proposing that the PV modules will generally be positioned at an angle of between 15 and 30 degrees from horizon and will take account of shading. Further information is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The East of England is a suitable location for solar development as it receives consistent levels of light. Further information is provided in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	Any new or restored green / open space and PRow should be sited and designed to ensure access across the life course and account for the uneven distribution across communities. The mitigation plans should identify the design principles or standards that will be adopted and any support for	Public Health England	No	The Applicant is not proposing to provide new PRow within the Order Limits or open space. The Applicant is providing a number of new permissive routes during the project's operating life which will be designed to appropriate standards but are not proposed to be publicly adopted. Further details of the permissive routes proposed can be found in Chapter 12 of

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	community engagement to promote use of these assets to local communities.			the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and National Grid's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties T/SP/SSW22.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant notes the guidance outlined in this response.
Design	We note that solar PV panels will be off set from watercourses by a minimum of 10m, which will ensure the majority of construction activities will be a minimum of 10m from surface watercourses. The applicant should be aware that the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant notes this response and has continued to engage with the Environment Agency following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Following the close of the statutory consultation the Applicant has been discussing with the Environment Agency appropriate terms that would enable flood risk activity environmental permits to be incorporated within the DCO, subject to agreement being reached on appropriate protective provisions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	obtained for any activities which will take place: on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal) on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal) on or within 16 metres of a sea defence involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission.			
Design	The current route of Fordham FP19 includes a hazardous crossing of the A142 Fordham bypass. So whilst tunnelling will be required nearby to take the electricity cables from the arrays to the Burwell sub-	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is aiming to improve access during the operating of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm by providing a number of permissive routes. Further information about permissive routes is given in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	station under the A142, could we ask for a pedestrian subway to be constructed?			[EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is not able to provide a subway under the A142 as its tunnelling techniques are designed to support the widths of the cabling required to connect the solar sites to the point of grid connection.
Design	Another issue relates to Burwell Lode. There is at present no bridge across the Lode near Burwell. When the underground cable is installed we could ask for mitigation to be addressed by the provision of a footpath bridge across the Lode in the vicinity of the cable.	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is not able to provide a bridge across the Burwell Lode. The Applicant is aiming to improve access during the operating of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm by providing a number of permissive routes. Further information about permissive routes is given in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Economy	Sunnica initially implied to local people that this scheme would have the capability of supplying 100,000 local homes with electricity. However, they have now confirmed that all generated electric will be supplied to the national grid. What local benefits are there?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on employment locally. It is estimated that construction will generate 1,685 net additional jobs per annum, of which 1,483 will be within 45 minutes travel time, and operation will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within 45 minutes travel time. Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] for further detail. A requirement to Schedule 2 of the DCO will secure the implementation of a Skills and Employment Management Plan to help identify opportunities for businesses to access employment and supply chain opportunities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Scheme.
Economy	It will create few if any long-term local employment opportunities. In all likelihood the proposal would result in a net loss of jobs and it will not supply sustainable energy to local housing, it will be sold for profit to large corporations and the National Grid. Had this been a publicly funded project there would have been an integral requirement to benefit the local community.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on employment locally. It is estimated that construction will generate 1,685 net additional jobs per annum, of which 1,483 will be within 45 minutes travel time, and operation will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within 45 minutes travel time. Please refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] for further detail. A requirement to Schedule 2 of the DCO will secure the implementation of a Skills and Employment Management Plan to help identify opportunities for businesses to access employment and supply chain opportunities associated with the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				construction, operation and maintenance of the Scheme.
Noise and Vibration	We note that the two applications to construct 49MW BESS installations at Burwell substation both include substantial efforts to mitigate noise levels with soundproof fencing and careful siting of equipment, and this is with far fewer numbers of containers and with air conditioning units mounted at ground level. This contrasts with the Sunnica proposal where far greater numbers of units would have air conditioning units mounted on top of the containers allowing the sound to travel.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operations based on the application design. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and will be secured pursuant to the Operational Environmental Management Plan to be agreed with the relevant local authority. A Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan EN010106/APP/6.2] has been submitted with the DCO application. With regards to the design of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), no significant effects have been identified and no mitigation measures beyond the embedded design have been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and Vibration	We remain unconvinced that the noise levels from construction, particularly piling and construction traffic, will be sufficiently mitigated to avoid harming established ecology (and in particular Stone Curlew) at the construction sites. The effect of nesting seasons also does not seem to have been taken into account, since they would apply across all sites.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council,	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has conducted further assessment activity and further developed its Scheme proposals including further refinements to Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This sets out how the Applicant is proposing to mitigate the environmental impacts of its construction activity, including to ecological receptors. The results of the Applicants assessments on the Scheme's impact on ecological receptors is included in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The assessment has taken the impact of nesting seasons into account, concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. The Applicant has amended the Scheme design to provide additional buffer between the Scheme and areas known to be used by the local stone curlew population. Parcels E11 and E23 (as shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) are no longer proposed for solar and will now form

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				ecological mitigation area ECO3 (shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). In addition to this, additional ecological mitigation is also proposed at ECO2, also shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES.
Noise and Vibration	The operations of the Scheme will cause ongoing issues of low-level noise pollution from the storage and transmission of energy.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operations based on the application design. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and will be secured pursuant to the Operational Environmental Management Plan to be agreed with the relevant local authority. A Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan EN010106/APP/6.2] has been submitted with the DCO application. Noise impacts of the solar plant (including the battery and inverters) during the operational lifetime are predicted to equate to a negligible to minor adverse effect, which is not considered significant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and Vibration	Has noise and vibration been discussed with the Newmarket Racing Community and the adjacent landowners to the West sites. Will Sunnica address the level of compensation provision to stable yards who cannot train their horses when construction activities interfere with the training schedule.	Snailwell Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has engaged with the horse racing community from the launch of the Scheme through to the submission of its DCO application. The Applicant is not proposing to provide compensation to stables in the area and construction activities are not expected to impact upon the operations of the local horse racing industry. Assessment of potential disturbances such as noise, glint and glare, and vibration during construction and operation have been assessed as part of the Applicant's EIA. The results of these assessments are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and confirm no significant effects were identified on the stables in the area. The noise receptors closest to Snailwell are R4 Snailwell and R5 Arran House. The Applicant's assessments have concluded that there will be no significant noise impact at these receptors during both construction and operations. The full results of these assessments are presented in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has developed its

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				proposals for construction based upon the outcomes of its assessments and in consultation with representatives of the horse racing industry in Newmarket. The Applicant's proposals for managing construction impacts from the Scheme are set out in Appendix 16C: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Noise and Vibration	We note the note in the planning applications for the BESS installations at Burwell that there have been regular complaints from local people about the noise levels from the Burwell substation, and that this is being actively monitored and investigated. Furthermore, noise mitigation for these much smaller BESS installations is required as part of the planning approval.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operations. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. With regards to the design of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), no significant effects have been identified and no mitigation measures beyond the embedded design have been proposed.
Noise and Vibration	Sound pressure level estimates for the BESS compounds in Chapter 11 of the PEIR Appendix 11D do	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operations. Where appropriate, the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	not appear to consider the cumulative effects of many BESS containers being installed in each location, and instead seem to rely on the operational noise level generated by a single container. Since the number of BESS containers at each site is not known, we do not see how overall sound pressure levels for each BESS compound could in any case be generated. Additionally, the cabinet plan in Appendix 11D [16] section 11.4.2 appears to show the air conditioning units inside the cabinet, and does not show the compressor units on top of the cabinets as detailed in Chapter 3.	Council, Worlington Parish Council		Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and will be secured pursuant to the Operational Environmental Management Plan to be agreed with the relevant local authority. A Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan EN010106/APP/6.2] has been submitted with the DCO application. The information presented in the PEIR was preliminary, and represented the results of the Applicant's assessments at a point in time. The Applicant is assessing multiple options as to the placement of air conditioning units inside the BESS. The assessment undertaken within Chapter 11 (Noise and vibration) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the scenario with the greatest impact. The plan in Appendix 11D (section 11.4.2) of the PEIR was indicative and showed one of the options under consideration.
Noise and Vibration	The impact from noise on PRow must be assessed	Public Health England	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	both at construction and operational phases.			operations. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Due to the transient nature of PRoW users they will not be subject to long-term noise exposure. Any noise experienced by PRoW users will be limited to when they are in proximity to the Scheme; when they are sufficiently far from the Scheme they would not be affected by noise from construction, operation or decommissioning phases. Effects on PRoW users from the combined effects from a number of topics (for example visual effects, effects on transport and access, and human health) have been assessed for a number of PRoW in Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In most cases, the difference between the visual effects on PRoW users and the overall change in-combination with the minor effects anticipated from disruption to the PRoW network and human health is expected to be a detectable but non-

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				material change. This effect interactions are therefore not expected to increase the significance of anticipated effects alone. The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. Inverters, switchgear and other equipment will be located away from PRow as shown by the parameters on the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] and as illustrated by the Parameter Plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). The Applicant has provided details of its proposed mitigation during the construction phase in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Further details of how the Applicant proposes to address likely impacts on the local community are set out in the Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN010106/APP/7.5].
EIA process	Natural England finds that the submitted preliminary information contains insufficient detail on several aspects of the environment,	Natural England	Yes	The PEIR presented preliminary environmental information required for the purposes of statutory consultation. The Applicant has since undertaken a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	including on effects to the environment and on the mitigation measures proposed to address these effects. Therefore, it has not been possible to fully assess the effect of the proposal on designated sites, protected species, priority habitats and soil. There is also a lack of detail regarding the various stages of the application.			and has considered the feedback received through the statutory consultation. The Applicant believes that the information presented in the PEIR during the statutory consultation was sufficient to facilitate meaningful consultation. The Applicant has continued to engage with Natural England following the statutory consultation and is grateful to Natural England for the response and subsequent engagement in guiding the Applicant's subsequent EIA activity. The results of the Applicant's full assessments are given in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
EIA process	We need much more detail on designated sites in subsequent submissions. It is simply not sufficient to explain in a short paragraph why there are no likely significant effects on a European site, without going into the detail why. We need a comprehensive explanation of how the application will cause direct or indirect effects to habitats or species via disturbance or changes in	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with Natural England following the statutory consultation and is grateful to Natural England for its response and subsequent engagement in guiding the Applicant's environmental impact assessment (EIA) activity. The results of the Applicant's full EIA are given in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and, with particular reference to European sites, the Habitat's Regulations Assessment: Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Appendix 8M of the Environmental

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	air or water quality and water levels.			Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]). It is the Applicant's view that the information presented in the Environmental Statement and it's HRA documentation is sufficient to enable Natural England to consider the impacts identified.
Heritage	There are significant areas of buried archaeology around Freckenham village. The Suffolk Heritage Explorer lists 200 finds for the immediate area around the Scheme alone. Though geophysical surveys have identified some intact buried remains such as those in E06, we remain concerned that the piling for panel supports up to 3.5 metres into the ground would damage other undisturbed finds in the panelled areas of the Scheme. The timescales for this proposal are a blip on the timeline of the sub-surface archaeological record in this area. Local finds such as the Mildenhall Treasure and the Rumbelow Hoard demonstrate the high	Freckenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	Yes	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessment alongside evaluation fieldwork, including geophysical survey and trial trenching. The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in several areas of significant archaeological activity being removed from the footprint of the Scheme. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	quality of the artefacts and archaeological record that could be damaged for short-term gain.			
Heritage	We consider the likely effects on the historic environment to be significant and in need of detailed consideration through the EIA process, including through the development of an Environmental Statement (ES). Following our review of the PEIR, it is encouraging, that it describes an integrated multi-disciplinary approach to heritage assessment, with a review of different environmental factors being used to inform each other where appropriate.	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's engagement and has continued its EIA activity in light of the responses provided by Historic England and other interested stakeholders. The results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Heritage	We are supportive of the detailed approach to the assessment of setting outlined in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage, of the PEIR where it relates to both designated and non-	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's engagement and has continued its EIA activity in light of the responses provided by Historic England and other interested stakeholders. The results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	designated built heritage assets and archaeological sites within 1 km of the Scheme boundary. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity is equally appropriately comprehensive in scope and the study area extends to 2 km from the Scheme boundary.			found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Heritage	We are keen to see that the assessment incorporates appropriately extensive buffer zones and areas of exclusion in relation to the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at the grade II listed Chippenham Hall, which is located approximately 2.5km south of the Sunnica East Site A.	Historic England	Yes	In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has updated its Scheme proposals in the vicinity of Chippenham Park RPG to incorporate additional setback from the Avenue at areas W04 and W05 (shown in Figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). Additional landscaping has also been provided in this area. Further details of the Applicant's design as submitted are provided in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan.
Heritage	In this context it is also worth noting the good practice advice notes produced by	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this response from Historic England, and confirms that the guidance referred to has

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Historic England on behalf of the Historic Environment Forum in GPA2; Managing Significance in Decision-taking in the historic Environment and GPA 3; The Setting of Heritage Assets. We recommend this guidance is both used and referenced in the full ES.			been used and is referenced in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Historic England is not normally consulted regarding grade II Registered Parks and Gardens. However, in this instance we recommended that the assessment included the significance of the park and garden and its constituent features and setting. The formal parkland is defined by brick boundary walls, while the south drive extends towards Newmarket.	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant has included the setting of the registered park and garden (RPG) and its local significance in its assessment of cultural heritage and in its assessment of landscape and visual impact. The assessment undertaken regarding the impacts on Chippenham Park RPG and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	There are significant areas of buried archaeology around Snailwell village. The Suffolk Heritage Explorer lists 200 finds for the immediate area	Snailwell Parish Council	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessment alongside evaluation fieldwork, including geophysical survey and trial trenching.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	around Snailwell alone. Though geophysical surveys have identified some intact buried remains such as those in E06, we remain concerned that the piling for panel supports up to 3.5 meters into the ground would damage other undisturbed finds in the panelled areas of the scheme. The timescales for this proposal are a blip on the timeline of the sub-surface archaeological record in this area. Local finds such as the Mildenhall Treasure and the Rumbelow Hoard demonstrate the high quality of the artefacts and archaeological record that could be damaged for short-term gain.			The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in several areas of significant archaeological activity being removed from the footprint of the scheme. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Heritage	We agree with the assessment of the RPG itself as being of medium sensitivity whilst the additional grade II* listed buildings within the RPG are of high sensitivity. The south drive (the Avenue) which	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's comments and has continued to develop its proposals taking into account the comments received during the statutory consultation. This has included incorporating additional planting around the Avenue at Chippenham Park. Further details of this can be found in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	extends to c. 4.3km, is the main 18th century entrance drive to the Hall and there is potential for harm to its setting as a result of major infrastructure within the surrounding agricultural land. With regard to mitigation, we are pleased to note that the PEIR states that no development will take place adjacent to the formal park boundary. With specific reference to Chippenham Park, we note that additional planting has been incorporated along the Avenue to enhance and reinstate the historic tree-lined avenue. We are of the view that this will be an appropriate method of mitigating against the harm that will be caused to its setting.			Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Heritage	Freckenham and Isleham Conservation Areas lie within the 1km study area; with the setting of Freckenham Conservation Area being	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's comments and their agreement with our initial conclusions. Consideration has been made of the potential effects on the conservation areas within Chapter 7

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	rural with open fields separating it from nearby villages. Isleham Conservation Area is focused on the historic core with later development extending to the east and west. Consequently, there is minimal appreciation of the conservation area from the surrounding landscape.			of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Within 1km of Sunnica East Site B there are 16 listed buildings, concentrated in the village of Worlington and the hamlet of Badlington. The Church of All Saints in Worlington is listed at grade I and is of high sensitivity and the remaining buildings are listed at grade II and are of medium sensitivity. Chippenham Hall RPG lies approximately 1.9km southwest of East Site B. There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of East Site B.	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's comments. Consideration of the assets identified is set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	In relation to Sunnica West Site A there are 18 listed buildings within 1km of the boundary and they reflect development during the medieval and post-medieval periods. They include four grade II* listed buildings; the parish Church of St Peter, The Old Rectory, the Lodges, Gateway and Railings at Chippenham Hall Park and the Stable Block, all of which are of high sensitivity.	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's comments. Consideration of the assets identified is set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	The grade II listed Chippenham Hall lies within 1km of the study area and partly within the Sunnica West Site A and is of medium sensitivity. Snailwell Conservation Area lies within the 1km study area and is south-west of Chippenham Hall. To the north, south and west the village is largely surrounded by woodland which gives it an enclosed character.	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's comments. Consideration of the assets identified is set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Regarding Sunnica West Site B there are 16 listed buildings that fall within the 1km study area; 10 of which are also included in the Sunnica West Site A area and four of which are listed at grade II*. The remaining six listed building are all grade II listed and are of medium sensitivity. Chippenham Hall RPG also falls within West Site B and is of medium sensitivity. Snailwell Conservation Area falls within 1km of West Site B as well as within the West Site A study Area.	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's comments. Consideration of the assets identified in set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	We consider the PEIR has identified in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage the relevant heritage assets in relation to each of the four Sunnica sites and we agree with the assessment of their significance. Despite the high level of detail provided in the PEIR, which is very welcome, we remain of the view that it is a	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant welcomes the comments from Historic England and has continued its assessment of heritage assets, the results of which are presented in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This includes assessment of the Scheme's impacts through photomontages, which have been created at locations discussed with Historic England. Photomontage locations were agreed at a meeting with Historic England. It was unfortunately not possible

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	prerequisite for the ES to demonstrate stated impacts through the use of appropriate photomontages and rendered images. We have previously provided advice on specific views in relation to heritage assets from which the impact of the development should be assessed and would welcome further involvement as preparation of the ES progresses.			to undertake all the photomontages agreed, as the team were refused access in some places.
Heritage	The proposed development comprises the installation of a number of PV panels that will be mounted by hand onto racks. It is not yet clear how many PV modules will be needed as this will depend on technological developments and therefore the full extent of any impacts cannot be determined in detail. Other potential impacts include topsoil stripping, compounds, construction compounds, localised	Historic England	No	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to develop its Scheme proposals while carrying out its EIA activity to assess the maximum possible impact of the Scheme and mitigate within the Scheme design where appropriate. As is established practice, the Applicant assessed the Scheme's impact according to the 'Rochdale Envelope' method of the maximum parameters or impact, meaning that a worst-case scenario for the impacts of the Scheme has been assessed in the PEI Report and the Environmental Statement. With regard to topsoil stripping and below

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	levelling, drainage, impacts from infrastructure, roads, habitat creation, substations, crane bases (if relevant) and other aspects of the proposal involving below ground works.			ground works, the Applicant has assessed the likelihood of such impacts in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and has proposed mitigation in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Heritage	It is stated in Section 3.5.6 that trenchless techniques will be used, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods to cross a range of existing infrastructure. Will these techniques require the use of drilling fluids, such as bentonite slurry? We are aware from previous schemes that there is the potential for the bentonite slurry used in the HDD process to breakout and spread into and coat archaeological deposits, features and materials under which the drill would pass. If drilling fluids will be used, information would therefore need to be provided regarding the chemistry, pH and composition of the	Historic England	No	It is expected that water based drilling fluids will be utilised for the trenchless techniques. The risk of breakout of drilling fluids to archaeological deposits, features and materials under which the drill would pass will be managed through the implementation of mitigation measures contained within a CEMP, which will be based on the Framework CEMP within Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which sets out the proposals for the measures to be undertaken in this regard.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	drilling fluid used and any impacts defined and considered. A strategy would also need to be developed to mitigate the risks of bentonite slurry outbreak to ensure that fluid pressures are monitored and an action plan developed so that any breakout will be handled quickly and efficiently. We would recommend this point is clarified in the ES and that appropriate mitigation is agreed and adopted.			
Heritage	It was noted in Appendix 7b that there was a relative absence of anomalies recorded in some areas following the geophysical surveys. However, it was also stated that this may be attributable to the limited land use in the fenland areas, or due to waterlogging generally inhibiting the magnetic enhancement of soils. It is not clear if the absence of anomalies is a true	Historic England	No	The Applicant acknowledges that there is a potential for previously unknown remains to be present and has carried out additional site investigations to further reduce the likelihood of such deposits being present. Mitigation measures to reduce the impact of the Scheme on such undetected deposits are set out in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	reflection of activity within these areas in the past, or if it is due to the limited visibility of anomalies using the geophysical technique employed so far. However, it is acknowledged that there is potential for previously unknown remains to be present and which in turn could impacted by proposed development (Table 7-10). We also recommend this point is clarified in the ES and that appropriate mitigation is agreed and adopted.			
Heritage	It is stated that the extent and nature of the embedded mitigation will be informed by the results of the Trial Trench evaluation investigations, which will provide information about the depth and character of the archaeological remains present (Section 7.7.6). We look forward to seeing the results of evaluation and details of the mitigation	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant has continued trial trenching activity following the statutory consultation. Where this activity has identified archaeological deposits, the Applicant is proposing mitigation. The results of these surveys and the accompanying mitigation are presented in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the DCO will require the production of a detailed archaeological mitigation strategy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	strategies in due course. We would highlight that there remains potential that additional significant (high value) areas may be identified during the ongoing evaluation process.			
Heritage	Table 7-10 within the PEIR outlines the proposed mitigation measures for the cultural heritage, and includes programmes of evaluation and associated palaeoenvironmental sampling, as well as dating and geoarchaeological assessments, which is welcome. In general, the proposed mitigation measures appear to be appropriate, but we would need to see the detailed method statements and sampling strategies for the proposed works. We recommend detailed DRAFT WSI and method statements are submitted for approval to	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with Historic England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. The methodology and results of the geophysics and trial trenching report are included in Appendices 7F, 7G, 7H and 7I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant welcomes Historic England's continued engagement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	HE prior to the submission of the DCO.			
Heritage	Heritage assets: Chapter 7, Cultural Heritage, of the document "Preliminary Environmental Information Report", (PEIR) lists many heritage assets which are going to negatively impacted by this proposal. Far too many to list here and probably more severely than the applicant's paid consultants are claiming. For example, the effect on the views from the hills arcing around to the south of Newmarket were not mentioned. We consider this alone to be a serious oversight. Although not open to the public, the historic residence of Dalham Hall is reputed to have the finest view of the Fens and Ely Cathedral from the hills around Newmarket.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets in accordance with relevant guidance and best practice, in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The results of this assessment and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. With regards to Dalham Hall, the Applicant has considered the wider landscape and has not identified any significant effects on this asset.
Heritage	It is stated that a programme of evaluation and	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant has not carried out any GI works at the pre-determination stage. All

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	palaeoenvironmental sampling will be undertaken with ground investigation, which will allow a detailed model of the deposits below the Scheme to be developed. We are pleased to see that a deposit model will be produced, as this will help to understand and characterise the deposits present within the Scheme as well as their archaeological potential. We recommend that the geoarchaeologists liaise with the geotechnical specialist during ground investigation works to ensure that opportunities to collect information are maximised. Further information can be found within the Historic England document 'Deposit modelling and Archaeology' (2020).			details of palaeoenvironmental sampling and recorded deposit sequences are included within the reports for the trial trenching works carried out by Oxford Archaeology in 2021. The results of these investigations are set out in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the reports themselves included as Appendices 7H and 7I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Intrusive ground investigations works to be undertaken prior to construction will be undertaken in consultation with geoarchaeologists and Historic England's 'Deposit modelling and Archaeology (2020)' guidance document will be followed.
Heritage	There is no discussion within Chapter 7 of the PEIR about the potential for waterlogged and/or preserved organic archaeological remains to be	Historic England	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has undertaken further assessment of the Scheme's potential impact on archaeological deposits through evaluation trial trenching,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	present within the development area. It is stated that a number of drains have been identified in some fields, which may have lowered the water levels in certain areas in the past, but the potential for waterlogged deposits to be present and for them to preserve archaeological and environmental remains of interest still needs to be considered when carrying out any evaluation works. Consideration should also be given to potential organic deposits in the Lee, Brook, Lark and Snail valleys and in tributary valleys. If waterlogged deposits and organic archaeological remains are present, the impact of the Scheme will need to be considered in terms of how it may alter preservation conditions within an archaeological site. For example, the buried cables may emit heat, or the groundwater levels or water			including deposits in waterlogged areas and organic archaeological remains. The methods and results of these surveys are included in Appendices 7H and 7I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 7 [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has continued to engage with Historic England following the statutory consultation, including on the potential for archaeological deposits in water. The Applicant's assessment found that the Scheme is not predicted to have any impact on groundwater levels. More information is set out in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	movement on a site could be affected by the use of piled foundations for each of the PV arrays. The piled foundations could also act as a pathway for oxygen, allowing it to enter the waterlogged deposits. All of these factors could potentially change the preservation conditions on a site that in turn could result in the damage and/or loss of delicate archaeological remains. We would recommend that the Historic England document 'Preserving Archaeological Remains' (2016) is referred to if waterlogged remains are discovered on the site, as a hydrological/hydrogeological conceptual model (HE 2016, Appendix 3) may be required to investigate how the proposed work may impact the groundwater levels within the Scheme. We therefore recommend this area of the scheme is considered in more detail,			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	mitigation adopted that takes potential waterlogging into account and the assessment amended prior to the submission of the ES.			
Heritage	Section 7.8 of the PEIR addresses the likely impacts and effects of the proposed Scheme, covering issues such as ground-breaking, moving machinery and the construction of new structures. This section discusses some of the physical impacts that may occur but does not discuss the possible impact (both direct and cumulative) that the Scheme may have due to the piled foundations and the cable trenches (Sections 3.6.6 & 3.6.7). These features can physically impact buried archaeological remains but there is also the potential that they may affect the local preservation conditions within an archaeological site.	Historic England	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has undertaken further assessment of the Scheme's potential impact on archaeological deposits including as a result of piling and within cabling areas and the cabling corridor, including deposits in waterlogged areas and organic archaeological remains. The Applicant's proposals to address the potential for the Scheme to impact on archaeology are set out in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	It is stated in Section 7.8.10 of the PEIR that findspots or metal detector finds are considered to be no longer present within the Scheme, and therefore there would be no impact on them. Although this statement is true, their presence does provide an indication of archaeological potential within an area.	Historic England	No	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present, including accounting for metal detector finds. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation is in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Section 7.9 outlines the additional mitigation and enhancement measures that will be utilised. We are pleased to see that avoidance and the preservation of archaeological remains is at the core of the mitigation strategy (Section 7.9.1), but where this is not possible, a programme of archaeological fieldwork will be implemented (Section 7.9.2). It is stated that the archaeological mitigation requirements will be set out in the Framework CEMP and	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes this comment from Historic England. A Framework CEMP (incorporating heritage considerations) is included within Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	a Heritage Management Plan, and we look forward to seeing this document.			
Heritage	A programme of pre-submission evaluation trenching will take place based on the results of the geophysical survey works in order to characterise the remains and ground-truth the findings of the survey work (Section 7.9.3). It is important that the 'blank' areas are also investigated in order to determine if the lack of anomalies is real, or if this relates, for example, to the due difficulties noted when applying magnetometry in wetland/waterlogged environments (Appendix 7b). This will ensure that the archaeological evidence can be characterised and will reduce risk and inform decision making in terms of future timing and resourcing. We recommend this point is clarified in the ES and that	Historic England	No	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme, including in areas where no such deposits have previously been detected, and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The reports on the trial trenching are presented in Appendices 7H and 7I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation is included in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	appropriate mitigation is agreed and adopted.			
Heritage	It is stated in Section 7.9.4 that an overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) will be prepared following the completion of the evaluation trial trenching investigations. This should set out the likely scope of mitigation that may be required, following evaluation. We would be happy to review this document prior to submission of the DCO, but we would also like to see the WSI prepared for the evaluation works in order to fully understand the strategies employed and the questions being addressed by this work. In particular it would be useful to see the dating and environmental sampling strategies that will be employed at the evaluation stage, especially for the areas where peat has been	Historic England	No	Historic England were consulted during the drafting of the WSI for the evaluation trial trenching work. The Applicant has continued to engage with Historic England following the statutory consultation. The methodology and results of the geophysics and trial trenching report are included in Appendices 7F, 7G, 7H and 7I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An overarching WSI will be prepared at the next stage, during detailed design of the Scheme. This will be developed in consultation with Historic England as well as the County Archaeologists.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	recorded, and the areas of the site that are waterlogged. For example, will samples be collected to investigate environmental remains such as pollen?			
Heritage	Table 7-17 summarises the residual effects that may result from the proposed development. Until the additional mitigation strategy is fully defined and agreed, it is not clear how this will reduce the effects on the historic environment.	Historic England	No	The Applicant has continued to refine its Scheme proposals following the statutory consultation including its mitigation strategy for heritage assets. The Applicant's assessments of the Scheme's impacts on heritage, and its proposed mitigation measures are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Section 3.7.1 of the Heritage DBA references the Regional Research Framework for the East of England, but this document is currently being updated. A revised draft version is currently available on the East Anglian Archaeology website and the references therefore need to be amended in this report too.	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and has amended references to the Regional Research Framework for the East of England in its DCO application documents.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	A number of sites discussed within the DBA have recorded the presence of human remains, both in terms of internments and cremations. We would recommend that the Historic England document 'The Role of the Human Osteologist in Archaeological Fieldwork Projects' (2018) is referred to when developing strategies for the evaluation and excavation stages of work.	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and has referred to 'The Role of the Human Osteologist in Archaeological Fieldwork Projects' (2018) in developing its proposals for the evaluation trenching works. The methodology and results of the geophysics and trial trenching report are included in Appendices 7F, 7G, 7H and 7I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant's approach to such works is set out in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Heritage	A range of archaeological sites have been recorded within the development boundary, dating from the Palaeolithic to the modern period. It will be important to consider the scientific dating techniques that are utilised, taking into account the periods that the different techniques cover, the materials that can be sampled, and the issues that may need to be addressed.	Historic England	Yes	Details of the scientific dating techniques employed during the archaeological fieldwork, including geophysics and trial trenching, have been included within Appendices 7F, 7G, 7H and 7I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The archaeological evaluation fieldwork contractor (Oxford Archaeology East) has also detailed these within their method statements for the works, and in their fieldwork reporting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	For example, the material selected for dating from peat needs to be carefully considered as it has been demonstrated that dating the different fractions (humic and fulvic acids, humin fraction and plant macroremains) from a single sample can result in different dates.			
Heritage	The discussion of the significance of the remains recorded within the Desk Based Assessment needs to be expanded upon in the Environmental Statement (Section 6.2). These sections state that the findings will contribute to the understanding of a particular period, and that their significance derives from their archaeological interest, but detail is needed to explain why. How will the information add to our current understanding or address research questions within the Regional Research Frameworks? We therefore	Historic England	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and has provided further information on how its surveys have contributed to the Applicant's understanding of a particular period within the Desk Based Assessments provided in Appendices 7C, 7D and 7E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	recommend this section is clarified and amended.			
Heritage	A gradiometer survey was carried out across a large proportion of the Scheme, but it is acknowledged that some areas could not be investigated due to access issues. It is also acknowledged that it was unclear whether the absence of anomalies in some areas was real or due to the limited magnetic contrasts recorded within the geophysical surveys. It is therefore possible that additional archaeological remains may be present in these areas, which need to be investigated as part of the evaluation stage of works.	Historic England	No	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme, including in areas where the Applicant had not been able to access during the preparation of the PEIR. Since statutory consultation the Applicant has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are included within Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Further evaluation through trenching (and potential alternative geophysical survey techniques) should be sufficiently robust to compensate for any limitations of the fluxgate	Historic England	No	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The Applicant has carried out these

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	gradiometer on the fenland/waterlogged/peat areas. The success of the technique appears variable. We welcome the opportunity to engage alongside Local Authority Archaeological Advisors.			surveys in consultation with Historic England and officers from the host authorities. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation is included within Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	We support that the location of the Scheme avoids direct physical impacts on designated heritage assets, with scheduled barrows at Chippenham that are within the scheme protected in an Archaeological Mitigation Area (National Heritage List for England number 1015246).	Historic England	No	The Applicant notes this comment and is grateful to Historic England for its engagement in preparing the Scheme DCO application.
Heritage	The report presents a narrative assessment of the different potential impacts on the setting of designated assets, with cross reference to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and the Zone of Theoretical Visibility. We have no particular objection to this approach to	Historic England	No	The Applicant has continued its assessment activity following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has produced an Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which includes reference to Scheduled Monuments as visual receptors in its Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. This can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	date in producing the PEIR. However, in response to Environment Scoping (26/03/2019), we noted that we would 'expect the Environmental Statement to contain a thorough assessment of the likely effects which the proposed development might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets', including setting, with cross-reference to other chapters such as, for example, noise, light, traffic and landscape. Scheduled Monuments are not specifically identified as Visual Receptors in Chapter 10 table 10-6 of the PEIR, but we therefore advise more detailed work is necessary before the ES would be acceptable.			Statement. Through the heritage chapter of the Environmental Statement, the Applicant has considered the impact that the Scheme will have upon elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets. Further information on this can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Heritage matters in the LVIA should also be addressed in the ES by heritage specific viewpoints, to illustrate points raised in assessment. We	Historic England	No	Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes an assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	therefore advise that the Environmental Statement should also be accompanied by supporting material such as photomontages and sections to illustrate key views to and from those Scheduled Monuments which are considered likely to be most affected and where visibility is indicated in Figure 10-11f, ZTV with barriers combined. This would provide evidence to support the analysis of cumulative impacts of both Sunnica East and West on individual monuments, and would inform design parameters.			agreed with Historic England during the consultation process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	We note a general commitment to viewpoints that will be prepared as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the ES, and would welcome the opportunity to contribute further to the methodology, which may involve the addition of a relatively modest number of further heritage specific viewpoints and visual receptor locations. This approach is suggested as the scheduled monuments comprise Freckenham Castle and prehistoric barrows, both of which are classes of monument that derive significance from their presence in the landscape. It would demonstrate also that steps as set out in Historic England Good Practice Advice Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3) have been followed.	Historic England	No	Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes an assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views agreed with Historic England during the consultation process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Freckenham Castle (NHLE 1006070) is included in the PEIR alongside discussion of Freckenham conservation area. Views to and from this Scheduled Monument would illustrate the ES narrative – would, for example, the infrastructure in field E33 be visible?	Historic England	No	Freckenham Castle lies within the medieval settlement, to the south of the present village core. No standing remains survive with the motte now the only remaining feature, rising to approximately 40ft. While the monument is no longer visible over long distances and is partially screened by tree planting, a key feature of its significance remains its relationship with the surrounding landscape. Built to command the local area, the appreciation of its setting is an important consideration. The Scheme will involve the introduction of PV modules within this context; however, the impact of this is limited due to the low-lying character of the development which will not erode the former prominence of the castle. Despite intrusion within its setting, there will be a very low impact on the asset's significance. As an asset of high value, the resulting effect will be minor adverse (not significant). Further details are provided in Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Section 7.8.29 notes that Howe Hill bowl barrow (1015011) is entirely screened from the scheme by vegetation surrounding Dane Hill farm – what about allocation W15? This is a barrow noted to stand to its original height. Additions to VR 35a and 36 would illustrate potential changes to the setting. Additionally, the barrow at Lumber Hill (1020395) would benefit from consideration, and is close to already identified VR 29.	Historic England	Yes	In response to feedback received through the statutory consultation, the Applicant has reduced the size of the developable area at W15 to include additional setbacks on the north west side and southern tip of the parcel. In addition to this, parcel W16 is no longer proposed for solar development. The southern part of W15 (shown in Figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will be visible from Howe Hill bowl barrow, and this will intrude on its largely agricultural setting. This will interrupt some of the visual connections to the Chippenham Barrow Cemetery to the south, although it will still be possible to understand the asset and its context. A minor adverse (not significant) effect on the setting of this asset has been concluded in Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme will be located a little over a kilometre from the bowl barrow at Lumber Hill, and a belt of woodland planting is located between the barrow and the Scheme, which will largely screen views. While Grid Connection Route A passes closer, this will not have any permanent effect on the setting of the asset. A minor

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				adverse (not significant) effect on the setting of this asset has been concluded in Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant's DCO application documents include assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views into the scheme from the vicinity of the assets to the east of the A11. The photomontages can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures 10-90 to 10-102 [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Heritage	The Bowl Barrow on Chalk Hill (1018097) lies immediately to the south of the eastern boundary of Sunnica East. It is noted in Section 7.8.18 that whilst long distance views to the west may be altered, the asset is shielded from the proposed development by a barrier of trees to the north and east which provides screening and separation, and that it is detrimentally separated from the landscape to the south by	Historic England	No	The Applicant's DCO application documents include assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views of the Bowl Barrow on Chalk Hill (NHLE 1018097). The photomontages can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures 10-90 to 10-102 [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the A11. Table 7.12 notes that the setting of this asset would be directly impacted by solar panels, but that the impact would be reversible in the long term. Illustrations would be necessary in the ES to support the assessment and confirm that the proposed mitigation measures are effective.			
Heritage	GPA3 notes that 'where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affect its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from... the significance of the asset. Negative could include severing the last link between an asset and its original setting.' Would any proposed infrastructure at E18 (BESS, control	Historic England	No	The Applicant's DCO application documents include assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views of the Bowl Barrow on Chalk Hill (NHLE 1018097). The photomontages can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures 10-90 to 10-102 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. While the Scheme will be visible within the setting of the asset, it will still be possible to understand it in the landscape, and its prominence will remain. The asset is partially shielded by trees to the north and east which provides screening and separation between the asset and Sunnica East Site B, and it is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	buildings) be visible from the Bowl Barrow on Chalk Hill, over and above the existing quarry and solar farm?			not considered that there will be further visual or character impact upon the asset in these directions due to the extant screening. There may be an impact on long distance views to the west. The A11 road to the south has also separated the asset from the landscape to the south, where two further barrows were previously located. Taking into consideration the extant screening to the north and east, the effect on the Bowl Barrow on Chalk Hill is considered to be moderate adverse (significant). Further details are presented within Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	There is a Scheduled Monument within Sunnica West A, 'four bowl barrows, part of Chippenham Barrow cemetery' (NHLE 1015246). In the vicinity are further barrows, the Rookery bowl barrow (1015244), Hilly Plantation bowl barrow (1015245), and a Barrow south east of Waterhall Farm (1015243). Impact on the designated monuments outside the development site is considered low, although	Historic England	No	The Applicant's DCO application documents include assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views of the four bowl barrows (NHLE 1015246). The photomontages can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures 10-90 to 10-102 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The assessment presented in Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the impacts of the scheme on all aspects

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	this could be illustrated in the ES. The four bowl barrows within the development would be located in land set aside for archaeological mitigation. Their setting is described as compromised as a result of the placement of the A1304. However, as noted above, consideration should still be given to the impacts of a proposal on what might be uncompromised aspects of an asset's setting. This is in line with recommended approaches to the assessment of cumulative impacts. The PEIR chapter also acknowledges potential cumulative impacts on the contribution that the setting makes to the significance of these monuments as major adverse.			of an asset's setting that could be affected by the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Further, the BESS and infrastructure site at W17 has potential to introduce a more industrial element into the landscape of the barrows. The ES would need to confirm if there would be further visual impacts that would need to be considered? On the other hand, for this group of barrows, the proposal would have the positive impact of removing Scheduled Monuments from cultivation. VR point 37c is in the proximity of the barrows, but refinements may be required to ensure they are covered.	Historic England	No	The Applicant has carried out a landscape and visual impact assessment of W17 in relation to the surrounding area including the barrows. This assessment has found that the BESS and compound area proposed for this location would have a moderate adverse impact on designated and non-designated Bronze Age barrows forming the western extent of the Chippenham Barrow Cemetery. Full details of the assessment can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen (1006868) is located on the western boundary of Sunnica West B, on the western side of the River Snail. It is described as being screened to the east, with potentially fleeting views of the development from its northern boundary. Section 7.8.40 notes that views to east, over the river from the monument, represent an agricultural context, albeit post-medieval, and changes are noted to be reversible; again, the ES could provide evidence to demonstrate this. This is near VR 47, and we recommend refinements are made to ensure it is covered.	Historic England	No	The Applicant's DCO application documents include assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views of the Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen. The photomontages can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures 10-90 to 10-102 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] details the assessment on designated assets. A negligible (not significant) effect has been identified for the Roman villa south of Snailwell Fen.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The provision of archaeological mitigation areas and removal of sites from cultivation offers the welcome benefits of physical protection and positive enhancement of designated assets. We would welcome further discussion on the long-term management of the set-aside archaeological mitigation areas, particularly that which includes the Scheduled barrows.	Historic England	No	The Applicant welcomes Historic England's engagement and has continued to engage with Historic England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. This engagement has included matters such as the long-term management of archaeological mitigation areas. This will be reflected in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP). An Outline LEMP has been provided in Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]
Heritage	A Historic Environmental Management Plan was advocated at Scoping stage, although section 7.8-9 of the PEIR states that one will not be prepared, but that an overarching Written Scheme of Investigation will be. These documents would fulfil fundamentally different purposes, and a Written Scheme of Investigation is unlikely to prove an appropriate mechanism to	Historic England	No	A detailed archaeological mitigation strategy is to be prepared and agreed with the statutory consultees (Historic England, Suffolk County Council, Cambridgeshire County Council) following the completion of all evaluation fieldwork and the agreement of detailed archaeological mitigation measures with them. This will be agreed and prepared following DCO consent.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	secure long term management of monuments.			
Heritage	There will be a requirement through planning policy to avoid and minimise harm to heritage assets, and there will be a presumption in favour of conserving designated assets. By following planning policy and guidance we would also additionally expect the Scheme to be creative in how it might offer opportunities for the enhancement of assets, and how the project might deliver public (heritage) benefit. The PEIR makes it clear that consideration will	Historic England	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to progress its Scheme design and has further considered the possibility of providing enhancements for heritage assets within the Order Limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	be given to the use, display and interpretation of archaeological evidence that will be revealed by the development. We are supportive of and encourage this approach.			
Heritage	Given the size of the Scheme the Environmental Statement should aim to make clear public heritage benefits as part of planned mitigation, and we expect to see this and the mechanisms for their delivery to be clearly set out.	Historic England	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to progress its Scheme design and has further considered the possibility of providing enhancements for heritage assets within the Order limits. This will be detailed within a heritage management plan to be agreed with the statutory consultees (Historic England, Suffolk County Council, Cambridgeshire County Council) following the completion of all evaluation fieldwork and the agreement of detailed archaeological mitigation measures with them post-consent. The management measures for the planting within the archaeological mitigation areas during operation will be reflected in the Landscape and Ecology

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Management Plan (LEMP). An Outline LEMP has been provided in Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]
Heritage	Continuing to adequately identify the significance of assets at an early stage and using this to evolve a baseline assessment and subsequent heritage and Environmental Statements and management plans will be critical in providing a strong basis for design decisions. This is particularly relevant in light of the NPPF (para. 189) requiring an applicant to describe the significance of any assets affected, and (paras.184 and 193) to conserve heritage assets in a	Historic England	No	The Applicant has prepared an Environmental Statement in accordance with relevant guidance and best practice and in consultation with stakeholders including the host authorities. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] as submitted has built upon the work outlined in the PEIR to ensure that the Scheme has responded to heritage concerns through its design. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] sets out how the application accords with the policies of the NPPF.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	manner appropriate to their significance. There must continue to be a particular focus on using setting, landscape and archaeological approaches to analysis, and we expect to see the Scheme actively respond to historic environment concerns. This is because it is an objective of sustainable development to protect and enhance the historic environment as outlined in the NPPF (paras. 8 and 200). It is vital that impacts on the historic environment are adequately identified. Where there is harm to the significance of heritage assets we note the requirement to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage assets' conservation and any aspect of the proposal (NPPF para. 190), and to have clear and convincing justification for any harm (para.194). This is essential in regard to			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	designated heritage assets or those of equal significance.			
Heritage	There will be an unknown loss of archaeology especially through the driving of foundation piles for the panels. There are already known archaeological finds in the PEIR, which is why the field to the East of Beck Rd in Isleham cannot be used for panels.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has carried out comprehensive studies into the Scheme's impact on cultural heritage including extensive geophysical survey and trial trenching. Where appropriate, the Applicant is proposing mitigation including design changes to the Scheme (including several fields off Beck Road). Further details can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The huge size of Sunnica West A and Sunnica East A and B mean that they are much less easy to integrate into the local landscape, and the Joint Response from SCC/CCC/WSC/ECDC notes the inability of the visual mitigation proposed to achieve this integration, with impact on multiple villages including Freckenham and Worlington.	Freckenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has further refined the Scheme design in response to feedback received through the statutory consultation to reduce the extent of development. At Sunnica West A the extent of modules has been reduced in relation to La Hogue Road and the B1085, via the removal of W13 and W14 (shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). The set back of PV modules from La Hogue Road has also increased to enable more planting in combination with the overall retention of the roadside hedgerows. At Sunnica East A modules are removed from the west of Beck Road, so fields remain between Freckenham and Isleham via ECO1 and ECO2. At Sunnica East B, the extent of modules in proximity to U6006 has been reduced, with E11 and E23 now no longer proposed for solar development. These areas now form part of the area ECO3 shown on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The incorporation of ECO3 increases the set back of modules from Worlington and West Row. There has also been additional setbacks and planting around the proposed BESS at E18 and E33. These areas are also shown on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The Scheme

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				includes new planting and suitable rendering of the BESS to aid in reducing the overall visibility of the modules, such that there is visual mitigation such that the Scheme is able to be integrated into the landscape and impacts mitigated for Freckenham and Worlington. The results of this Assessment and details of the Applicant's proposed mitigation are included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	What is now regarded as a landscape of open countryside will become adversely changed to one of in the main of solar panels with the resultant glint and glare. We believe that the assessment and mitigation of the impact on the landscape is both incomplete and inappropriate.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. To avoid and mitigate visual impacts for users of the countryside the scheme proposes extensive new planting, offsetting PV modules from PRow and retaining existing vegetation wherever practicable to provide immediate screening. The height of the PV modules has also been lowered during the design process, to 2.5m in height. Further information on the Applicant's proposals for landscape and visual mitigation can be found in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant has assessed the Scheme's potential impact on glint and glare. The assessment is provided in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.
Landscape and visual amenity	Increased size means increased infrastructure, and the substations and BESS compounds are huge, covering 78 acres in total. As the scheme seeks to connect directly to the National Grid at Burwell, 10-metre-high substation equipment is required at the three BESS compounds. This would cause significant visual intrusion, and is very difficult to hide from view, being particularly alien to the farming and countryside landscape.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to develop the design for the Sunnica Energy Farm. This takes into account the potential impacts on the landscape and visual impacts resulting from the infrastructure, substations and BESS compounds relating to the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Suitable mitigation has been proposed as a result. Full details of the Applicant's assessment can be found in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has provided details of its proposed mitigation, including a large amount of planting, set out in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Plan (Appendix 10I) [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Landscape and visual amenity	The local environment and visual landscape impact: It will adversely affect the Chippenham Fen Nature Reserve. It will turn a rural farming area into areas of shining industrial landscape dotted with large, tall buildings and other structures ranging from 3m to 12m in height.	Fordham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has further refined its proposals in the area around Chippenham Fen in response to feedback received during the statutory consultation and the results of the Applicant's EIA activity. The Applicant has also continued to engage with a number of stakeholders including Natural England and the host authorities. The design includes setbacks from Chippenham Fen at parcels W01 and W02. These areas are proposed to include native grassland and wetland planting alongside archaeological mitigation areas. The impact from the Scheme on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				ecological receptors, including Chippenham Fen, is assessed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and concluded no significant effects on habitats and wildlife. The Applicant has assessed the visual impact of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm from a number of receptors, including villages and Chippenham Fen. Full details of the Applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment can be found in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	We consider that screening is ineffective and poorly designed, using the cheapest possible planting regime at the expense of mitigation effect. Mitigation is monotonous, instead of including character trees in an attempt to produce a realistic skyline.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant does not consider the proposed screening to be ineffective and poorly designed. The Applicant's proposals to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm have been designed following a number of assessments and through engagement with relevant stakeholders including the local authorities, accounting for the local landscape character. Further information on the Applicant's proposals for landscape and visual mitigation can be found in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is proposing embedded visual and landscape mitigation, the details of which can be found in Appendix 10I: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment from National Grid and National Grid Gas and has incorporated this advice into its proposed planting in the vicinity of existing overhead power infrastructure. Details of the Applicant's proposed planting and landscaping can be found in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	Such loss would change the very character of our villages forever. In particular, the current beautiful rural views would be replaced with: acre	Isleham Parish Council	No	The role of the Applicant in undertaking an environmental impact assessment (EIA) in consultation with the Planning Inspectorate, statutory undertakers and the host authorities, is a well-established

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	after acre of 2.5m high solar panels, huge banks of 2 storey high batteries, visually intimidating security and deer fencing, the (temporary) closure of existing footpaths and by-ways. We deem there to be a need for wider, independent environment impact assessments to be undertaken.			part of the planning process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) such as the Scheme. The results of the Applicant's EIA activity are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This includes a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement. The proposed modules are set back from Isleham and will be screened by woodland. Views will remain across the landscape between Isleham and Freckenham as modules will not extend to the west of Beck Road. Footpaths between Freckenham and Isleham will remain open with the provision of a new permissive path.
Landscape and visual amenity	Some site choices cannot ever be mitigated, such as the view north from the Limekilns on the edge of Newmarket.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has considered the impact from the Limekilns through visual receptor 38 as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme is judged to have a residual significant adverse effect in relation to people's view from the Limekilns; however mitigation is embedded within the design, via the tonal rendering of the BESS, additional planting

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				and retention of existing vegetation such that the effects are predicted to be moderate adverse, rather than major adverse.
Landscape and visual amenity	Some areas slope uphill away from dwellings in Freckenham, e.g. Lee Farm on Isleham Road, with no intermediate planting. Far from being flat, the land around Freckenham undulates as it transitions from the Fenland landscape to the Rolling Chalklands, exacerbating the effect of the significant panelled areas and making effective mitigation more difficult to achieve.	Freckenham Parish Council	Yes	The extent of proposed development has been reduced following consultation, so that there are no modules to the west of Beck Road and in proximity to Freckenham. The proposed modules in the grounds of Lee Farm will be bordered by retained vegetation and new planting, such that there will be intermediate planting to mitigate the visual effects. The revised Scheme design can be seen in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The assessment has taken this planting in to account. Further details of the Applicant's proposed planting and the assessment of effects can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	We note that during webinars the timeline for construction included mitigation planting (hedges, trees and grassland) at the end of the two-year construction phase. This means two lost years of potential growth in screening versus planting at the beginning of construction. We consider the reduction in set-back distances from 20 metres to 5 metres may have influenced this decision.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	It has always been the intention to plant at the end of the construction phase as this represents a 'worst case' scenario for the assessment of likely landscape and visual effects. It is also industry practice to implement new planting over winter conditions, so the new plants can adapt more readily than in summer conditions, such that the timetable for new planting can be offset from the completion of construction activity. Any opportunity to implement planting earlier within the construction programme would be explored, with areas planted as soon as practicable.
Landscape and visual amenity	We believe that the proposal scheme does not give appropriate weight to landscape and visual impact. We believe that the proposed scheme also contravenes Forest Heath LDF Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2001-2026 policies CS3 Landscape Character and the Historic Environment and CS5 Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In addition to this, the Applicant has considered the local and national planning policy context within the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application and concludes that there the Scheme is not in breach of these policies. The Applicant recognises that is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the Scheme's landscape and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				visual impact against the benefits of renewable energy generation.
Landscape and visual amenity	The proposed grass will not be sewn until after construction is finished, presenting a 2-3-year visual eyesore. The grass would also be of a slow growing, native species with your own experts admitting that it would take up to 5 years to form a sward capable of grazing sheep on.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is following established best practice in providing embedded mitigation within the Scheme's design, this includes grass planting. The requirements of construction mean that it is not appropriate to carry out such planting prior to the end of the construction phase and it is also a precautionary approach for the assessment of landscape and visual effects. Planting once the construction activity has ceased maximises the likelihood of the planting surviving and establishing itself. Any opportunity to implement planting earlier within the construction programme would be explored, with areas planted as soon as practicable. It is standard practice not to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				allow sheep to graze grass which has not established. A closely knit sward of grass will take time to fully establish. The Applicant expects the Scheme's impacts on the landscape will be reduced over time as the vegetation and planting intended for screening of the Scheme matures, this is essential to the approach of providing embedded mitigation. Further details of the Applicant's proposed planting can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	Some batteries units will be 10 metres high including their air conditioning units and will therefore be very visible despite screening measures.	Chippenham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant recognises the potential landscape and visual impacts of the battery energy storage system (BESS) and has incorporated changes to the Scheme design following the statutory consultation including additional landscape buffers in relation to the BESS at E18 and E33 (shown in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]). The Applicant has carried out a full assessment of landscape and visual impacts, including for the BESS and has presented the results and its proposed mitigation in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Landscape and visual amenity	Vegetation planted if the scheme is to proceed should be required to be semi mature/mature on planting, not small whip planting.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Applicant is following established best practice in providing embedded mitigation within the Scheme's design, this includes planting. The Applicant is proposing planting that is suitable for the character of the local landscape and which maximises the likelihood of the planting surviving and establishing itself. Further details of the Applicant's proposed planting can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Landscape and visual amenity	If approved this proposal would completely change the rural environment and character of village communities in this part of East Cambridgeshire and	Isleham Parish Council	Yes	The proposals have offset the modules from Isleham, with the intervening distance consisting of grassland and trees to soften and screen views of the PV modules. The Applicant has revised the design to omit any modules to the west of

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	West Suffolk. Proposals of this magnitude are normally located in places of vast wasteland, not within village communities. Despite claims within your consultation document the northern edge of 'East Site A' falls less than 400m from the edge of our village and will have a significant impact on all aspects of our village community.			Beck Road, such that the rural character would remain to the south of Isleham and between Freckenham, via ECO1 and ECO2 (as shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The combination of the offset from Beck Road and no development to the west of Beck Road is considered to reduce the perception of the modules and reduce the impact to the village character. The full results of the landscape assessment and details of the Applicant's proposed mitigation are included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	There were unqualified answers regarding possible glare damage to low flying aircraft accessing the two local RAF bases.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the Scheme's potential impact on glint and glare. The assessment is provided in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The assessment concluded that the Scheme will have no impact on RAF Mildenhall as no solar reflections are predicted for any of the scoped and assessed aviation receptors. No detailed modelling was recommended for RAF Lakenheath as no significant effects are

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				expected given the considerable distance of the airfield to the Scheme.
Landscape and visual amenity	Key views, in particular those of Ely Cathedral: It will have a negative effect on key views from the hills above Newmarket around and to the north of Dalham Hall, from the Icknield Way Trail and from the Devils Dyke across Burwell Fen.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed visual assessment which is included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. View from Ely Cathedral, which is 15km from the Scheme, will not be impacted due to the distance. Nor will views from the Icknield Way be impacted, as the route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point). Views from the Devil's Dyke are included in the assessment as receptors 58 and 59. There will be no negative effects in views from the Devil's Dyke due to the distance from the scheme and the intervening vegetation. The Scheme will not be visible from the hills around Dalham Hall, which is 7km to the south-east of Sunnica West Site A. This is due to more elevated and wooded land between Dalham Hall and the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Scheme, including woodland in close proximity to Dalham Hall.
Landscape and visual amenity	Freckenham has an emerging Neighbourhood Plan, with many key milestones already achieved. Already published are the Landscape Study (Character and Sensitivity Appraisal), Key Views and Supporting appendices, undertaken by a Chartered Landscape Architect and approved by the Parish Council. In particular we draw attention to: • Chapter 3 of the Landscape Study which notes "...the parish is on a transitional position with three-character	Freckenham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant notes the emerging Freckenham Neighbourhood Plan and has had regard to the Landscape Study and Key Views Report referenced within the Plan. Details of the Applicant's own landscape studies and character assessments, along with an assessment of the landscape and visual effects to relevant receptors identified by the Neighbourhood Plan work can be found in Appendix 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant is no longer proposing to use parcel E07 for solar development. This area (now called ECO2) is proposed to provide additional grassland planting and habitats for local wildlife, including stone

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	types found in the parish - the east is generally considered 'Estate Sandlands', the west 'Rolling Estate chalklands' and with fingers of 'Settled fenlands' coming in from the North..." This underlines the importance of designing mitigation that respects the landscape character. • Chapter 5 of the Landscape Study which presents a Landscape Value and Visual Sensitivity analysis for each Character Area analysed in the report, with Landscape Areas R1 and R2 (to the North of the village) assessed as Very High and High respectively. • The Key Views report which analyses key views around the village and presents Change Management Objectives for each. Viewpoints 2, 3 and 4 look towards the proposed scheme. ▪ Effects on wildlife.			curlew, such that there will be no development to the west of Beck Road and the character of intervening fields between Freckenham and Isleham to the west of Beck Road will be retained This area can be seen in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	We would like to see greatly increased levels of hedgerow/woodland to the Southern and Eastern site boundaries to further reduce the impact on the view from the public highways along/near to those boundaries.	West Row Parish Council	Yes	In response to feedback received through the statutory consultation, parcel E07 on the west side of Beck Road is no longer proposed for solar development (renamed ECO2). New woodland is proposed to the east of Beck Road to screen development within the grounds of Lee Farm. The Applicant's revised Scheme proposals are set out on the Works Plans and Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plans and can also be viewed in the parameter plans included in the Environmental Statement figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Landscape and visual amenity	We do not believe that the proposed screening will be effective. Evidence suggests that it will take between 5-8 years (nearly a quarter of the lifespan of the entire project) before the planting reaches the 2.5m height to obscure the panels and fencing. Even longer would be needed to screen the 6m high Battery Energy Storage Systems.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is following established best practice in providing embedded mitigation within the Scheme's design, this includes the proposed planting. The requirements of construction mean that it is not appropriate to carry out such planting prior to the end of the construction phase. This maximises the likelihood of the planting surviving and establishing itself. The Applicant accepts that the Scheme's impacts on the landscape will be reduced over time, this is essential to the approach of providing embedded

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				mitigation. Further details of the Applicant's proposed planting can be found in Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Landscape and visual amenity	The Scheme will require significant amounts of ongoing care and attention to facilitate the growth these trees. Even then it should be anticipated that approx. 20% of all new planting is likely to die within the first two years of planting (see A14 tree planting as an example of such loss).	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has prepared an Outline LEMP as part of its DCO application. This can be found in Appendix 10I [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The OLEMP sets out the Applicant's proposals for planting and its management which will then be followed through to detailed LEMPs. Subject to receiving development consent, planting that does not survive will be replaced to ensure that the Scheme's landscape and visual impacts are mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	We would also suggest that additional screening is required in several areas of the Environmental Landscape Masterplan including the top left side of E05.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is proposing a significant volume of planting between parcel E05, Beck Road and Isleham to screen the Scheme from view. Further information on the Applicant's proposals for landscape and visual mitigation can be found in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Landscape and visual amenity	It must be recognised that this is a very quiet and relatively unspoilt area of East Cambridgeshire with rolling agricultural countryside crossed by the meandering River Kennett and rising up gradually from the Fen landscape around Burwell into the chalk lands of West Suffolk and the chalk hills arcing around Newmarket and westwards to Cambridge and beyond. It is our opinion that the author of the PEIR has completely misunderstood	Fordham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme as presented will industrialise the local area. A suite of specialist reports have been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include a full landscape and visual impact assessment alongside a landscape character assessment and a description of the landscape character areas that surround the Scheme. The landscape and visual assessment in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes an assessment of winter conditions and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the gentle local landscapes in both Cambridgeshire and Suffolk and has failed to comprehend their significance historically, visually or as the settings for the villages and farms which these landscapes encompass. Consequently, the categorisation of landscape sensitivities as “very low” and “low”, results in the clear underestimation of landscape and visual impacts of this proposal. The boring ranks of solar panels will turn the current vibrant landscape into a dead area, visibly industrial and totally unnatural. There will be a range of large industrial box-like structures varying in height from 3 metres to 6 metres, 10 metres and 12 metres at several very visible locations within the sites and accompanied in some places by boring office and control buildings. No level of tree planting in			summer conditions, and therefore the Applicant has taken into account the fact that trees lose their leaves in autumn. In terms of the height of structures, these are understood, and the Scheme proposes extensive new planting in combination with the retention of existing vegetation where practicable to reduce the perception of the Scheme. The sensitivity of the landscape has been revised in light of updates to the methodology, but in accordance with assessment guidelines the judgement on sensitivity is in respect of the scheme, not an inherent landscape sensitivity. Therefore, where the scheme proposes localised excavation for underground cables, the sensitivity is considered appropriate to be judged at the lower scales.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	mitigation will hide the visual harm. Trees will take time to grow and, as usual, the author seems to conveniently forget that trees lose their leaves in Autumn and don't get them back until Spring.			
Landscape and visual amenity	Sunnica will use 30 miles of two metre high deer fencing to protect the scheme. They propose to plant sapling trees to screen this fencing, however these will take at least 15 years to form effective screening. Please can it be explained how we will be screened from the enormous effects of this scheme?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is following established best practice in providing embedded mitigation within the Scheme's design, this includes planting. The Applicant is proposing planting that is suitable for the character of the local landscape and which maximises the likelihood of the planting surviving and establishing itself. Further details of the Applicant's proposed planting can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	SLAF accept that part of the proposals is in Cambridgeshire but Sunnica West A, west of Kennett, will have a major adverse visual impact from Suffolk as you enter Newmarket from Kennett. We are concerned that the section that accommodates the Icknield Way will have a major adverse visual affect, we cannot believe that the Newmarket Horse Racing Industry can agree the visual impact from the Icknield Way which links the Snailwell Stud and has a great deal of equestrian use when exercising the gallops.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant has assessed the potential landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Views from the Icknield Way will not be impacted, as the route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point). The Applicant has engaged with the horse racing community from the launch of the Scheme through to the submission of its DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	Impact on the character and appearance of the streetscape/buildings: It will have negative impacts on the character and setting of local Cambridgeshire villages such as Kennett, Chippenham, Snailwell, Fordham and Burwell as well individual farms, homes and cottages.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has continued to develop its Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to assess the Scheme's impacts on local villages and design the Scheme to offset development from these villages. The Applicant is proposing extensive embedded mitigation to reduce the Scheme's impact on the surrounding landscape. The full results of this Assessment (including in respect of impacts to villages) and details of the Applicant's proposed mitigation are included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The glint and glare of the proposals will be substantial and SLAF believe that additional planting needs to be considered to reduce this.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant has assessed the Scheme's potential impact on glint and glare. The assessment is provided in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This includes an assessment of impacts for users of PRow, bridleways and permissive paths. Within this assessment, the Applicant has found that screening in the form of existing and proposed vegetation will significantly obstruct the visibility of the reflecting PV modules for most

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				observers; however, effects at some locations are predicted prior to and following the implementation and establishment of the mitigation measures. Solar reflections experienced by an observer along the PRow, bridleway, or permissive path are not deemed to have a significant impact upon the amenity of an observer due to the reflections having no associated safety hazard, the intensity of a reflection to common outdoor sources of glare that are frequently visible to observers, and the existing sunlight effects. No significant impacts are therefore predicted upon pedestrians or riders, and no further mitigation is required. The Applicant's assessment of landscape and visual impacts and proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10I: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The loss of amenity and views across open countryside cannot be understated, some of the photographs submitted do not fully consider the loss of the view. No photographs seem to consider the user could be sitting on a horse where the views are much more significant.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant has assessed the potential visual impact of the Scheme from a variety of receptors, including from equestrian users. The assessment includes photographs from publicly accessible locations which can be accessed by horse, but the photographs are taken at eye height, not from a horse. The assessment considers both equestrian users and pedestrians for the assessment where relevant. Details of these assessments can be found in chapter of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the photomontages provided within the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The Applicant has agreed the locations of the viewpoints with the host authorities.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	This proposal does not appear to be either located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscape. All proposals however should complement and where possible enhance local distinctiveness and be guided by your Authority's landscape character assessment where available, and the policies protecting landscape character in your local plan or development framework.	Natural England	No	The Applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been prepared according to industry best practice and in consultation with the host authorities and taking account of the local landscape character. The full results of this Assessment and details of the Applicant's proposed mitigation are included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	Natural England is not providing detailed advice on landscape due to the fact the application is not located near or within an AONB or national park. However, we note that the solar panels will cover a wide area and are likely be visible from designated sites that are visited by the public, such as Chippenham Fen National Nature Reserve (NNR). Furthermore, due to the size of the application and the	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that the size of the Scheme has the potential to create significant impacts on the local landscape. The Applicant has prepared a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment according to industry best practice and in consultation with the host authorities. Where appropriate, the Applicant is proposing mitigation where significant impacts are identified. With regard to Chippenham Fen National Nature Reserve, parcels W01 and W02 (Figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) have been design

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	topology of the landscape, it is likely they will also be visible from several settlements. This may have an effect on landscape character and visual amenity within these locations.			such that the PV modules are located away from Chippenham Fen, the River Snail and Snailwell Road so as to reduce the visibility of the Scheme from motorists and conserve the landscape features including woodland and the river. The full results of this Assessment and details of the Applicant's proposed mitigation are included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	We also have concerns about the visual impact for users of the countryside. What measures will be taken to avoid/mitigate against this?	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Yes	To avoid and mitigate visual impacts for users of the countryside the scheme proposes extensive new planting, offsetting PV modules from PRoW and retaining existing vegetation wherever practicable to provide immediate screening. The height of the PV modules has also been lowered during the design process, to 2.5m in height. Further information on the Applicant's proposals for landscape and visual mitigation can be found in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The 55km Bexwell to Bury pipeline is a proposed scheme within the interconnecting water pipelines programme. This new asset is expected to be in place and operational prior to completion of Sunnica East Site A and associated development. Our appraisal has concluded that based on current data, the optimum route would be to the west of Freckenham. We consider this route, which diverts to the west of Sunnica East Site A is the optimum solution reflecting environmental, cost and engineering factors. The route finalisation is subject to ongoing surveys, including an onsite geophysical survey. We will continue to share information to ensure possible impacts are identified and taken account	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant welcomes this comment and will continue to engage with Anglian Water to minimise the impacts on the Bexwell to Bury pipeline and the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	of in the final design and planning of both projects.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	At Sunnica East Site A, near Isleham there is an existing 500mm strategic water main which crossed the proposed solar farm site as illustrated on the attached plan. It is essential that we can continue to access and maintain this asset for our customers following the construction of this solar farm. To enable this, we require an easement width of 6m either side of the pipe to be set out in the wording of the Draft DCO. It appears that proposed PV arrays as proposed would be bound by a perimeter fence as shown on Figure 3-1. Anglian Water will require continuous access to the 500mm strategic water main located within the site boundary. Therefore, access should be provided to enable Anglian Water to maintain and operate this asset following construction. Should there be a requirement for any	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant welcomes this response and has continued to engage with Anglian Water following the statutory consultation. The Applicant is aiming to conclude an agreement with Anglian Water and reflected the requirement to access the 500mm strategic water main near Isleham through changes to the project design. Details of the proposed protective provisions can be found in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	associated cabling to cross this existing asset we would wish to agree how any potential impacts to the above asset would be mitigated as part of the construction of the Scheme.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Parts of the application area are identified to be within Source Protection Zones (SPZs, specifically SPZ 2 and SPZ3) meaning that it lies within the catchment of protected groundwater abstractions used for water supply. The site overlies various superficial Secondary Aquifers and a bedrock Principal Aquifer (associated with chalk strata and the Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk groundwater body). Principal aquifers are geological strata that exhibit high permeability and provide a high level of water storage. They support water supply and river base flow on a strategic scale. Secondary aquifers are often capable of supporting water supplies at a local scale and normally provide an important source of flow to some rivers. The PERA identifies available BGS borehole logs show a groundwater level beneath the site of between 4.0m and	Environment Agency	Yes	The Applicant is grateful for the Environment Agency's comments and has continued to develop its proposals and has assessed the potential of the Scheme to pollute water resources during construction, operation and decommissioning. This reflects the Applicant's assignment of groundwater as High Importance (value). The Applicant is proposing pollution prevention measures sufficient for SPZ2, these are presented in Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has prepared a Framework CEMP (see Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] that includes measures to ensure the safety of water resources, surface water and groundwater during the Scheme's construction phase.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	5.25m below ground level (bgl). In summary, the regional use of groundwater in this area makes the site highly vulnerable to pollution.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	There are various surface water features on site and in the surroundings; including the Lee Brook, the River Kennett, the River Lark and the River Snail. Due consideration should be given to the impacts that the proposed development may have upon controlled waters receptors during both construction and operational phases. We would refer the applicant to our groundwater position statements in 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection' available from gov.uk. This publication sets out our position for a wide range of activities and developments, including: infrastructure, land contamination, discharges to ground, groundwater resources and waste management. Position Statement C1, relating to nationally or regionally	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant welcomes the Environment Agency's comments and has had regard to the advice contained within the groundwater position statements in preparing Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	significant schemes, is particularly pertinent.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	We agree with the classification of the Scheme as 'Essential Infrastructure', with the existing site use being classified, at worst, as 'Less Vulnerable'. The majority of the Scheme lies within Flood Zone 1 and therefore the Sequential and Exception Tests do not apply. However, there are elements of the Scheme that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 and the determining authority should ensure it is satisfied that the requirements of the Sequential Test have been met by PEIR Chapter 4 'Alternatives'. The final Flood Risk Assessment should also demonstrate that the elements of the Scheme that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 meet the requirements of the Exception Test.	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant has provided evidence for the classification of the Scheme as 'Essential Infrastructure' in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.1] and sets out how it considers the requirements of the exception and sequential tests are met by the relevant parts of the Scheme, in the Flood Risk Assessment appended to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	At Sunnica East Site B near Freckenham and Worlington there is a 3-inch water main in Freckenham Road (B1102) which appears to form part of the site boundary. As such we would wish to agree how any potential impacts to the above asset would be mitigated as part of the solar farm.	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential impact of the Scheme on the identified asset and has further engaged with Anglian Water to discuss how adequate protective provisions can be incorporated into the project design. The Applicant has also engaged with Anglian Water with a view to reaching agreement on protective provisions and related agreements. Details of the proposed protective provisions are included within the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	At both Sunnica West sites there is a 6-inch water main in Chippenham Road which appears to form part of the site boundary which presumably will be utilised for access. Similarly, there is an existing 8-inch water main which runs in parallel to the slip road from the A1304 (to the north of the A14). This appears to be located within the proposed woodland area on the boundary of the site. As such we would wish to agree how any potential impacts to the above assets would be mitigated as part of the construction of the solar farms.	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential impact of the Scheme on the identified asset and has further engaged with Anglian Water to discuss how adequate protective provisions can be incorporated into the project design. The Applicant has also engaged with Anglian Water with a view to reaching agreement on protective provisions and related agreements. Details of the proposed protective provisions are included within the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Along the cable route there are a number of locations where the route crosses existing water mains and sewers maintained by Anglian Water. These include: Burwell: there is a 90mm water main located in Broads Road adjacent to Burwell Water Recycling Centre. A142/Newmarket Road roundabout: there is an existing 8-inch water main located within the existing roundabout and the A142 and Newmarket Road. There is also an existing sewerage pumping station (Fordham Biggen Stud, FORBSP) which is located to the east of the A142 roundabout. A14/A1304 junction: there is an existing 8-inch water main which runs in parallel to the slip road from the A1304 (to the north of the A14). As such we would wish to agree how any potential impacts to the above assets	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential impact of the Scheme on the identified asset and has further engaged with Anglian Water to discuss how adequate protective provisions can be incorporated into the project design. The Applicant has also engaged with Anglian Water with a view to reaching agreement on protective provisions and related agreements. Details of the proposed protective provisions are included within the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	would be mitigated as part of the construction of the cable route. In relation to any existing above ground assets, we would expect these to not be included within scheme boundary.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	It is not clear where the solar farm drains are likely to be located in relation to the Chippenham sites and what type of drains are being used i.e. are they likely to be tile drains? There is insufficient detail to establish whether there are any pathways that will result in hydrological change to Chippenham Fen RAMSAR, Fenland SAC and the nationally designated sites, soils and landscape. Panels in close proximity to peat soils may result in a reduction in the quantity of water, leading to a drying effect, or drains linked to the Chippenham Fen hydrology may result in pollution or sedimentation within the system. Springs may form within the system if the hydrological system becomes saturated. Old/faulty batteries may cause leaching into the environment if not checked/replaced where necessary. It is not sufficient	Natural England	No	The Applicant has provided additional information relating to the proposed drainage system for the Scheme within Appendix 9C Flood Risk Assessment, including Drainage Strategy [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This proposes to mimic natural drainage, and uses above ground grassed channels, or swales, to pick up overland flows. There are no tile drains or underground drains as part of the Scheme. The proposed drainage system has been designed in order to minimise impacts such as hydrological changes. The Scheme is not anticipated to cause impacts upon the Chippenham Fen RAMSAR and Fenland SAC. The groundwater flow which supports the fens will not be impeded by the Scheme. Peat deposits are located within the SAC site and do not extend across the Order limits so will not be impacted. The Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) will be within containers, and self contained. This allows the drainage system within the containers to be managed and separated from surface water drainage. This has been considered in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	to say there is no likely significant effect in the PEIR without providing more detailed reasoning as to why this is the case.			[EN010106/APP/6.1] and the drainage strategy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Parts of the development area are within Groundwater Source Protection Zones 2 & 3, pollutants entering the groundwater in these areas could potentially contaminate the public drinking water supply. Therefore, during the construction phase activities need to be carefully managed to prevent pollution. We would advise early discussion with the Environment Agency regarding proposed discharges to watercourse/land as part of this development, e.g. dewatering. Fuel and oil storage needs to comply with the Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations 2001 where relevant. Best practice guidance should be followed where the Regulations do not apply, including for chemicals stored on the site, i.e. provision of secondary	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant has continued to engage with the Environment Agency following the conclusion of the statutory consultation, this includes discussions regarding the management of construction activities to minimise impacts to water resources and potential dewatering where shallow pits may need to be dug temporarily for the installation of cabled beneath watercourses and the railway line. The Applicant has prepared a Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] that includes measures to ensure the safety of water resources during the Scheme's construction phase. This includes: controls for surface water runoff, details of management for fuel storage and vehicle washing, management of spillage risk, use of plant nappies etc.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	containment, e.g. drip trays. Spill kits should be located in delivery and storage areas. Staff should be trained on what to do in the event of a spill/leak. Only clean uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any watercourse, soakaway (including SUDS) or surface water sewer. Vehicle washing effluent must be collected and disposed of to an appropriately authorised site. Sewage should be discharged to the foul sewer where possible.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The plan provided appears to identify part of Burwell Water Recycling Centre (formerly sewage treatment works) in Anglian Water's ownership being located within the redline boundary. From our previous discussions we understand that the intention is that cable route would avoid this operational site. We would therefore ask that Burwell Water Recycling Centre is not included within the final scheme boundary and this plan is amended to this effect.	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design in response to feedback received through the statutory consultation. This includes amendments to the boundary to avoid the Burwell Water Recycling Centre. Details of this can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The final Flood Risk Assessment should include a verification of flood zones, particularly in relation to the Burwell National Grid Substation Extension and the apparent reduction in flood risk under modelled climate change scenarios. It is noted that the draft FRA states that the 'Environment Agency will be consulted to confirm the breach modelling undertaken as part of the SFRA is acceptable and no further modelling is required' and we would welcome this consultation.	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant has provided verification of flood zones in the Flood Risk Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.3] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Environment Agency (EA) have been consulted and the product data was obtained from the EA.
Water resources	We agree with the approach that no assessment of operational phase flood risks from the cable routes is included as these will be below ground. However, the final Flood Risk Assessment and accompanying CEMP should provide details of how construction within flood zone 3 will be managed to ensure it is safe and there	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant has provided details as to how it proposes to manage construction at the parts of the Scheme within flood zone 3. This can be found in the Flood Risk Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.3] and Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	are no impacts offsite. Reference should be made to the Environment Agency's standing advice.			
Water resources	We note that no sewer records were available at the time of writing the draft Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and PEIR therefore these must be obtained for the final FRA and Environmental Statement to verify the conclusions within the draft FRA and PEIR. PEIR chapter 3 Scheme Description states that the 'minimum height of the lowest part of the Solar PV modules will be 0.6m AGL', however, we recommend that the height of solar modules within flood zone 3	Environment Agency	Yes	Sewer records have been obtained which confirm that there are no sewers within the Order limits. The Flood Risk Assessment has been updated to confirm this [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The Applicant has proposed height for PV modules within flood zone 3 using mAOD. The Applicant has provided further details as to how it proposes to manage construction at the parts of the Scheme within flood zone 3. This can be found in the Flood Risk Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.3] and Appendix 16C CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	should be set using mAOD rather than ground levels.			
Water resources	It is proposed to develop two office/warehouse buildings located at Sunnica East Site A and Sunnica West Site A. We understand that there is potentially a requirement for a connection to water supply network and to discharge foul flows to the public sewerage network from these buildings. We would recommend that the Applicant obtains pre-planning advice from Anglian Water for the proposed office/warehouse buildings to inform the application to be	Anglian Water	No	The Applicant has considered the potential impact of the Scheme on the identified asset and has further engaged with Anglian Water to discuss how adequate protective provisions can be incorporated into the project design. The Applicant has also engaged with Anglian Water with a view to reaching agreement on protective provisions and related agreements. Details of the proposed protective provisions are included within the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.			
Water resources	Within the PEIR chapter on flood risk, Drainage and Water Resources: we note that the report outlines the potential risk of flooding from all sources including sewer flooding for the proposed solar farms which is welcomed. In relation to sewer flooding we can provide details of historic flooding where relevant for the proposed solar farms to inform the preparation of the Flood Risk Assessment.	Anglian Water	No	The Applicant welcomes Anglian Water's advice on this matter and has continued to engage with Anglian Water following the conclusion of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	There is an existing foul sewer located within Newnham Road which forms part of the Scheme boundary. It appears that the cable route would cross this existing sewer. As such we would wish to agree how this asset will be mitigated as part of the construction of the cable.	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant has further engaged with Anglian Water to discuss how adequate protective provisions can be incorporated into the project design. Details of this are included within the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].
Water resources	In reference to the PEIR's approach to foul drainage strategy: reference is made to the options available for managing the proposed welfare sites which includes connecting to the nearest available public sewer. We would recommend further advice is sought from Anglian Water to inform the development of the foul drainage strategy.	Anglian Water	No	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has further engaged with Anglian Water in the development of its foul drainage strategy. Details of this can be found in Chapter 9: Flood risk, drainage and water resources of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	We support the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for surface water management where they do not present a risk to controlled waters. Infiltration SuDS need to meet the criteria in our Groundwater Protection Position Statements G1 and G9 to G13. We welcome the details within PEIR Chapter 9 Water Environment Table 9-4 which provides responses to previous comments from the Environment Agency with regards to surface water drainage.	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant welcomes the Environment Agency's engagement in the Scheme's development to date and has submitted updated details of the proposed SuDS in the drainage strategy and the Flood Risk Assessment in Appendix 9C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This was also discussed in the consultation meeting on 16th April 2021.
Water resources	Soakaways must not be constructed in contaminated ground. Proposed infiltration SuDS areas should be considered with regards to the potentially viable pollutant linkages identified within the PERA such that these areas are suitably investigated and assessed to ensure soakaways are not	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant has considered the relationship between the Scheme's proposed infiltration SuDS and viable pollutant linkages. Further information can be found in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	constructed in contaminated ground where they could cause the remobilisation of contaminants into controlled waters receptors.			
Water resources	Infiltration SuDS greater than 2m depth are generally not acceptable and infiltration should have minimum 1.2m clearance above peak seasonal groundwater level.	Environment Agency	No	Shallow swales were discussed as acceptable during the meeting with the LLFA on 31st March 2021, in the absence of GI information. A maximum depth of 600mm is proposed within the drainage strategy (see Appendix 9C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	We would expect any SuDS to have mitigation measures in place to allow for treatment of and reduction in contaminant levels in the surface water run-off. SuDS should be constructed in line with good practice and guidance documents which include the SuDS Manual and the Susdrain website. We will require detailed information about the proposed treatment train components. We refer the Applicant to the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for comments on other aspects of the surface water drainage scheme.	Environment Agency	No	The Simple Index Approach assessment has been included within the drainage strategy. This concludes that the level of mitigation being provided is sufficient. The treatment train approach is discussed in the drainage strategy, and demonstrates the swales provide sufficient mitigation. The drainage strategy is part of the Flood Risk Assessment (see Appendix 9C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	In reference to the PEIR's approach to Surface water drainage strategy: it is proposed to make use of infiltration techniques, swales and attenuation basins to manage surface water run-off from the proposed development. As such the proposed surface water strategy for the proposed development does not appear to interact with Anglian Water's operated assets. Therefore, we would expect Cambridgeshire County Council and Suffolk County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authorities to comment on the suitability of proposed method of surface water drainage.	Anglian Water	No	The drainage strategy methodology was agreed with the LLFA during a consultation meeting on 31st March 2021. The drainage strategy is included as part of the Flood Risk Assessment (see Appendix 9C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	We would wish to reach agreement about the wording for Anglian Water to be included in the Draft DCO including the protective provisions prior to submission of the application. This would include specific easement widths for affected water and water recycling assets. If you would like to suggest any changes or additions to these provisions, we would be grateful if these could be shared with Anglian Water for comment.	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential impact of the Scheme on the identified asset and has further engaged with Anglian Water to discuss how adequate protective provisions can be incorporated into the project design. The Applicant has also engaged with Anglian Water with a view to reaching agreement on protective provisions and related agreements. Details of the proposed protective provisions are included within the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].
Water resources	We would ask that the provisions relating to the discharge of water to the sewerage network to be included in the Draft DCO include reference to consultation with Anglian Water prior to the approval of the requirement(s) by the relevant local planning authorities.	Anglian Water	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential impact of the Scheme on the identified asset and has further engaged with Anglian Water to discuss how adequate protective provisions can be incorporated into the project design. The Applicant has also engaged with Anglian Water with a view to reaching agreement on protective provisions and related agreements. Details of the proposed protective provisions are included within the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further details of the Applicant's

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				communications with Anglian Water can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].
Water resources	The site is partly located within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 on our Flood Map for Planning. We welcome Chapter 9 Flood Risk, Drainage and Water Resources of the PEIR which refers to appropriate legislation and policy, including supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessments.	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant welcomes the Environment Agency's engagement in informing the Scheme's development and has had regard to the feedback received through this engagement.
Water resources	We would also like to see further clarification on the proposed use of irrigation water (for agricultural use) for cleaning purposes, as it is our understanding that this would not be licenced as it goes against its intended use.	Worlington Parish Council	No	It is not the intention of the Scheme to utilise irrigation water for cleaning purposes within the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Site investigation is required to evaluate the need for any remediation works to protect the water environment. We welcome the PEIR recommendation for a site investigation including trial pits, window sample boreholes with well installations, monitoring and analysis of samples. Details of proposed investigation locations have not been provided. The investigation should include targeting areas where potentially viable pollutant linkages have been identified and an assessment of the potential risk to controlled waters. Dependent upon the findings, further investigation/assessment and remediation works may be required. The developer should address risks to controlled waters from contamination at the site, following the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework	Environment Agency	No	The required site investigations will be carried out post consent, as stated within Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In preparing its proposals, the Applicant will follow relevant guidance including the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination. This approach was discussed during the consultation meeting on 16 April 2021.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	and the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There appears to be no ancient woodland located on the site.	The Forestry Commission	No	This is correct, there is no ancient woodland located within the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	This is a large-scale development which has the potential to impact many species and habitats. Ecological surveys have recorded many protected species and as such appropriate mitigation to prevent damage and enhance these species and habitats is essential throughout the development, working lifespan and decommissioning of the project.	Environment Agency	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the Scheme has the potential to impact ecological receptors. The Applicant has undertaken a full environmental impact assessment (EIA) to assess the likely impacts and where appropriate, suitable mitigation is proposed. The Ecology and Nature Conservation chapter is included within Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has further developed its proposals for ecological mitigation areas in consultation with stakeholders including Natural England and the Environment Agency. Details of the Applicant's proposed ecological mitigation can be found in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The small blocks of woodland on the site seem to have been retained by Sunnica and new planting has been proposed. The woodland removed should be matched by woodland replanted with extra to compensate. Especially woodland lost within E26,27,28 of the Sunnica East B site totals to c.5ha and will need to be compensated for, with net gain expected.	The Forestry Commission	No	No woodland will be lost as part of the Scheme. The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We found that the Chapter 10 of the PEIR Appendix 10b provided a good summary of the existing trees/plantations within the boundaries of the site red line and as mentioned in 3.1.25. Where trees are to be lost to facilitate the development, robust replacement planting is likely to be required as mitigation.	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant welcomes the engagement from the Forestry Commission and is proposing robust planting as mitigation across the Scheme as set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Biodiversity net gain as set out in the Environment Bill, requires development to deliver at least a 10 per cent improvement in "biodiversity value". Whilst this does not currently apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) a number of developers including Highways England have been keen to demonstrate their environmental credentials by delivering this on their sites. We would hope that if trees are lost compensatory tree planting will seek to deliver at least this target, for two reasons: Firstly, to compensate for the loss of carbon sequestered by maturing tree, growing trees take a long time to reach that level of existing maturity and carbon equilibrium. And secondly, established trees often act not just as stepping stones or foraging sites for bat species between sites, but also individually	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant welcomes the engagement from the Forestry Commission. The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	support a multitude of biologically diverse species living on them. Compensatory planting will require the provision of a suitable space and un-compacted soil volumes to allow tree establishment.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Retention of existing trees on site is the preferred option so we are pleased to see this is the plan.	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant welcomes the engagement from the Forestry Commission. The intention is to retain existing trees wherever practicable as illustrated on the Parameter Plans (see figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Any biosecurity plan needs to include the issue of pests and diseases on site too. There are a number of notifiable species of trees pests and diseases a number have come into the UK from packing materials in the past, there is a method for reporting any via Tree Alert.	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant acknowledges this risk and details of biosecurity measures are set out in the Framework CEMP Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Where small woods are to be retained the space for management should be considered, e.g. vehicular access.	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant has considered the management of mitigation areas during the Scheme's operating life in the Scheme design. Further information is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme Description and Appendix 10I: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1 and 6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The proposed site has several birds of national significance, one Annex 1 (the Stone-Curlew) and 5 WCA schedule 1 bird species. The site is also close to seven international, nine national and 31 locally designated sites for nature conservation and therefore the disturbance of the 2 years of construction and 40 years of solar panels will have a vast impact on our long-term ecosystems and biodiversity.	Chippenham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has reviewed its proposals having had regard to the feedback received through the statutory consultation and has made a number of changes to the Scheme design to ensure that there is appropriate habitat in place for bird species, including stone curlew. Parcels E11 and E23 (as shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) are no longer proposed for solar and will now form ecological mitigation area ECO3 (shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). In addition to this, additional ecological mitigation is also proposed at ECO2, also shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES. These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas. In terms of sequencing, the Applicant is proposing to provide mitigation enhancements, where appropriate but specifically with regard to stone curlew, in advance of construction. Further details are given in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				No significant adverse effects have been concluded for any designated ecological sites during construction, operation or decommissioning. A Habitats Regulations Assessment, Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken and is provided in Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We note that in the Scoping Opinion the MOD raises points about the construction of the scheme attracting birds to the site and potential bird strike safeguarding concerns.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant notes this view from the Scoping Opinion, Appendix 1A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and has assessed the potential of the Scheme to attract flocking birds to the area such that it might raise the risk of a bird strike. The Scheme will not create habitat that will attract significant numbers of flocking birds to the extent that they would pose a risk to aviation. Further details can be found in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Sunnica's proposed mitigation for most wildlife begins after the 2 years of construction, meaning irreparable damage will have already been done? How will this important wildlife be protected?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is proposing to provide mitigation enhancements, where appropriate, in advance of construction. Further details are given in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The analysis of noise and vibration from the BESS compounds (e.g. air conditioning units) does not appear to take into account any ecological effects.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The design of the Scheme will comply with industry good practice and environmental protection legislation in noise protection. The Applicant's assessments have concluded that there are no pathways during operation that will affect identified ecological features in the vicinity of the Scheme. Further information of effects of the Scheme on ecological receptors can be found in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Forestry Commission has an Ecological Site Classification tool which can be used to aid decisions over species choice for a particular site. The UK Forestry Standard provides more information regarding actions to address climate change although as we have already mentioned we are aware there isn't within the plans any proposals for large scale removal of trees.	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant welcomes the advice from the Forestry Commission and has developed its proposals for the site having had regard to the UK Forestry Standard. Further details are provided in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	If considering Biodiversity net gain please note that the Defra biodiversity metric has been updated and this will be released within the next two months, this places a higher value on woodland than in the current metric.	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant has noted this change and has developed its Scheme proposals in accordance with the most recent metric.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Mention is made on the effect on (nesting) stone curlews but often the greatest success has been achieved in onion fields where foxes due to scent cannot predate the nests. Actually a large, fenced area would be good for stone curlews. SLAF have worked closely with Natural England in areas of Open Access to provide restrictions to public access to reduce the disturbance; in reality, it is dogs that are the main problem in disturbing the stone curlew.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	Yes	The Applicant welcomes this advice. A maximum of ten 2ha Stone Curlew plots are to be provided across areas ECO1, ECO2 and ECO3 in parameter plans figures 3-1 and 3-2, included within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. These plots will provide both nesting and foraging habitat and are set in areas amounting to approximately 108ha of grassland creation and reversion to semi-natural grassland from arable. Details as to their establishment are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has also had regard to Natural England's advice regarding the character of the proposed stone curlew habitats. This is discussed and the rationale is set out in Section 5.3.6 of Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	If tree planting of any kind is necessary within these plans, then deer fencing will be required either individual fencing for individual trees or deer fencing around a plot. This area being close to Thetford Forest has a significant deer control issue.	The Forestry Commission	No	The Applicant is proposing to establish a perimeter fence around the developable area early in the construction period. This will consist of 2 metre high fencing. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We would hope that every effort is made to reduce the spread of ragwort which is a poisonous and notifiable weed that will kill livestock.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is proposing to manage ragwort in a controlled manner through a weed wiper, targeted spraying or by hand weeding. This information is included in the Outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan, Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The parish council is concerned at the effects on wildlife and the environment and productive farmland.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Scheme has sought to integrate the development into the existing environment, retaining areas important to wildlife, including woodlands, hedgerows, areas grasslands and watercourses. An assessment impacts on all ecological features is presented Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' land. Agricultural land is not lost to the temporary development and agricultural production will be maintained throughout as site will be grazed by sheep. The fallow period created by the scheme being in situ will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility has been provided in Chapter 12 and Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1 and 6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Ecology Chapter 8 of the PEIR Analysis and mitigation proposals raises significant questions about the preservation of the habitat for bird species including Stone Curlew, found within Sunnica East A and B. We support the statement in the Joint Response from SCC/CCC/WSC/ECDC questions the approach to mitigation and requests further details. West Suffolk Council Policy DM10 notes mitigation must be in place in advance of construction, not just in advance of the breeding season. This contrasts with statements during webinars which indicated that mitigation works would begin at the end of the construction phase.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has reviewed its proposals having had regard to the feedback received through the statutory consultation and has made a number of changes to the Scheme design to ensure that there is appropriate habitat in place for bird species, including stone curlew. Parcels E11 and E23 (as shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) are no longer proposed for solar and will now form ecological mitigation area ECO3 (shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). In addition to this, additional ecological mitigation is also proposed at ECO2, also shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES. These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas. In terms of sequencing, the Applicant is proposing to provide mitigation enhancements, where appropriate but specifically with regard to stone curlew, in advance of construction. Further details are given in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Protected species: We leave the Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust to comment on this expertly but we think it highly likely that protected species will be affected and that wildlife habitats and corridors that have existed for hundreds if not thousands of years in this area will be damaged.	Fordham Parish Council	Yes	The Scheme has sought to integrate the development into the existing environment, retaining areas important to wildlife, including woodlands, hedgerows, areas of grasslands and watercourses. An assessment of the impacts on all ecological features is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We welcome the aim to provide net gain with this application. It should be relatively easy on an application site as large as this to create habitat and ecological corridors to improve biodiversity and support species across the sites. Care needs to be given to keep distinct the offsetting measures required to make the proposal acceptable for Stone-curlew under the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and wider Net Gain enhancement measures to improve the wider benefits for wildlife. There are, however, opportunities to provide additional enhancements to these offsetting measures, for example by providing mitigation not only for the loss of stone curlew nests, but also to make up for the extensive loss of foraging habitat for this species. This approach would support not just Stone-curlew but also	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant welcomes Natural England's engagement and has continued to engage with Natural England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7]. In response to feedback received through the statutory consultation, the Applicant is proposing a number of design changes including the removal of parcels E07, E11 and E23 (shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) from solar development to set the Scheme back from known stone curlew habitats. These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas and are shown as ECO2 and ECO3 in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	many other bird species, including skylark and little ringed plover. We would also be very happy to discuss any enhancements concerning Chippenham Fen and the surrounding area; proposals that would improve connectivity there and increase species diversity between the sites would be very welcome indeed.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We would recommend consideration be given to the Natural England Technical Information Note TIN101 'Solar parks: maximising environmental benefits' and the BRE publication 'Biodiversity Guidance for Solar Developments'.	Natural England	No	The Applicant welcomes engagement from Natural England and has developed its proposals having had regard to the recommended documents.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Scheme will cause the destruction of wildlife corridors and nesting and feeding habitats, especially of ground nesting birds such as the Stone Curlew and Lapwings as well as on the hunting grounds for Marsh Harriers, Buzzards and Barn Owl. Once gone such habitats will not be easily recovered. Removing or attempting to relocate these established habitats will have disastrous consequences for the species within them. The mitigation measures that have been proposed by Sunnica are completely inadequate.	Isleham Parish Council	Yes	The Scheme will retain areas important as wildlife corridors, including woodlands, hedgerows and watercourses, to avoid a loss of connectivity for wildlife and fragmentation of habitats or species populations. The creation of diverse grasslands both within the areas to include PV modules, but also within the area of undeveloped land within the Scheme, will improve the connectivity for wildlife across the Scheme, improving links between areas of existing habitats. An assessment of impacts on all ecological features is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. In response to feedback received through the statutory consultation, the Applicant is proposing a number of design changes including the removal of parcels E07, E11 and E23 (shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) from solar development to set the Scheme back from known stone curlew habitats. These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas and are shown as ECO2 and ECO3 on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	As submitted, the application could have potential significant effects on Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), Chippenham Fen National Nature Reserve, Ramsar site and Fenland Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Natural England requires further information in order to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation.	Natural England	Yes	The potential effects on the Breckland SPA, Chippenham Fen NNR and Ramsar and Fenland SAC have been assessed in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant adverse effects have been concluded for these designated (or any other designated ecological sites) during construction, operation or decommissioning. A Habitats Regulations Assessment, Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken and is provided in Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We note that the submitted PEIR suggests that none of the stone curlew found within or in close proximity to the application site are part of the Breckland SPA population. Based on the evidence at the time, this was also the position that Natural England previously took. However, the RSPB have collected more recent evidence as part of a current bird ringing project on the application site. This has demonstrated that five of the birds within the application site have travelled between the application site and Breckland SPA. Natural England always provides advice based on the most up to date evidence available and, following a review of this new information, Natural England are of the view that the new information is robust and that the birds on the application site are likely to be part of	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the updated advice from Natural England and has continued to engage with Natural England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation to develop appropriate mitigation. A Habitat's Regulations Assessment: Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement) [EN010106/APP/6.2] has been submitted with the DCO. Parcels E11 and E23 (as shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) are no longer proposed for solar and will now form ecological mitigation area ECO3 (shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). In addition to this, additional ecological mitigation is also proposed at ECO2, also shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES. These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas. This increases the area set aside for stone curlews to 108ha. Stone curlew plots have been further developed in consultation with Natural England to provide sufficient nesting and foraging habitat that meet the criteria set out by Natural England. Details of these are

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the Breckland SPA population. We consider, therefore, that the loss in nesting density created by the loss of five nesting pairs on the application site is of likely significant effect to the SPA population. In addition to the loss of these nests, there is also an extensive loss of Stone-curlew foraging habitat to consider, as a result of this application. Please note that birds that nest outside the SPA but that still form part of the SPA population are regarded the same as the birds that nest within the SPA, both in the context of evaluating effects to the SPA but also in terms of the assessment against the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.			included in the Offsetting Habitat Provision for Stone Curlews Specification Plans [EN010106/APP/6.6] and Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant recognises the importance of the pairs in this location and have carried out the assessment on that basis. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Natural England recognises the importance of solar energy, along with other forms of renewable and low carbon energy sources as a valuable part of the UK's energy future. However, it is important that the benefits of solar power's contribution in tackling climate change are balanced against any impacts to the sites and species within which the proposal is located.	Natural England	No	The Applicant recognises the potential of the Scheme to cause a number of impacts to the local landscape and ecological receptors. These topics are among a range of matters assessed by the Applicant as part of its Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) activity. Where impacts have been assessed as causing a significant effect, the Applicant is proposing mitigation. Full details of these assessments and the Applicant's proposed mitigation can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Its EIA and HRA assessments have concluded that the Scheme will not cause a significant impact to habitats or species. The Applicant believes that it is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the Scheme's residual impacts (impacts that remain once mitigation is established) against the benefits of renewable energy generation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is important to note that interpretation of legal requirements, and particularly the differentiation between whether measures such as habitat creation can legally be considered as mitigation or compensation under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) have evolved significantly following a number of judgements from the Court of Justice for the European Union. It is Natural England's role, as a statutory nature conservation adviser, to provide advice about the ecological impacts of any development proposals on nationally and internationally designated sites and the ecological effectiveness of any actions taken to address these impacts. In our responses regarding these actions we use the phrase "offsetting measures": this term encapsulates	Natural England	No	This is understood. The Applicant's consideration of its proposals has been undertaken in recognition of relevant recent ECJ and UK judgements and the approach taken on other projects and its proposals in respect of habitat management and creation have been described accordingly in its application documentation. In particular, it is content that its stone curlew plots should be considered as mitigation, not compensation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	everything from measures to avoid impact, enhancement measures, 'mitigation' or 'compensation' measures in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). Whilst Natural England may offer comment on the appropriateness of these measures, or their likely ecological success it is for the competent authority, to determine the legal status of these measures.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Putting to one side the legal status of these measures, whilst the three nest plots and the habitat that is recommended within the Ecology report are a good starting point, ecologically these measures have not been sufficiently targeted to Stone-curlew and there is not an adequate amount of land provision.	Natural England	No	The Applicant has removed parcels E07, E11 and E23 (shown in Figure 4-4 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]) from solar development to set the Scheme back from known stone curlew habitats. These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas. These areas are shown as ECO2 and ECO3 in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. This increases the area set aside for stone curlews to 108ha. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Stone curlew plots have been further developed in consultation with Natural England to provide sufficient nesting and foraging habitat. Details of these are included in the Offsetting Habitat Provision for Stone Curlews Specification Plans [EN010106/APP/6.6] and Appendix 10M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Natural England advises that each nesting pair requires 16ha, so that in this case a minimum of 80ha of semi-natural heath should be created and maintained in perpetuity for Stone-curlew. This land needs to adhere to the following criteria: - Not more than 1.5km of any residential settlements, infrastructure or major roads; - Not within 500m of any buildings or smaller roads ie. access roads; - Not within 400m of any PRow, other permissive path or area used for recreation; - Position away from forested areas or dense hedgerows. Soil type: stony free-draining soils are required on rendzinas, brown calcareous earths, brown sands, brown calcareous sands, argillic brown earths and paleoargillic brown earths Nutrient levels: low phosphorus (< 15 mg/l ideally < 10 mg/l) soil nutrient levels are required, or would	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has removed parcels E07, E11 and E23 (shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) from solar development to set the Scheme back from known stone curlew habitats. These parcels will now form part of a wider network of ecological mitigation areas. These areas are shown as ECO2 and ECO3 in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. This increases the area set aside for stone curlews to 108ha. The Applicant has had regard to Natural England's advice regarding the character of the proposed stone curlew habitats. Further details are provided in chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I) [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Stone curlew plots have been further developed in consultation with Natural England to provide sufficient nesting and foraging habitat that meet the criteria set out by Natural England. Details of these are included in the Offsetting Habitat Provision for Stone Curlews Specification Plans [EN010106/APP/6.6] and Appendix

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	need to be developed, in order to achieve semi-natural grass land, characteristic of Breckland and suitable for Stone-curlew. Stone-curlew generally nest in open fields with dry soil, with areas of dry, bare, stony ground or low vegetation, and habitat creation has to be managed to achieve this. Factors associated with site location are those which would need to be considered when electing land for mitigation. Factors associated with habitat features are considered to be those which can be actively managed to improve habitat suitability.			8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Given the size of this application and the large area of supporting habitat that is likely to be lost, we would recommend that the provision is rather more generous than 80ha and furthermore that the proposed nest plots are also provided as planned, to provide sufficient measures to offset the loss to nesting density of this species created by the proposed application. We would recommend that any mitigation strategy is submitted to us with sufficient time to review it, preferably via DAS, as this issue is complicated and time is short once the formal process begins.	Natural England	Yes	In response to feedback received through the statutory consultation, the Applicant is proposing additional supporting habitat for stone curlew, the details of which have been developed in consultation with Natural England and the RSPB. The total area proposed now totals 108ha. Further details can be found in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is possible to create Stone-curlew habitat that will also support other species, as has been recommended in the report, however it is important to be mindful of the location as Stone-curlew are known to be very sensitive to disturbance created by human activity. We note that the habitat that is described within the ecology report is actually next to a path, which as you will see above, would not be suitable for Stone-curlew due to the potential for disturbance. Natural England would be very happy to work with the applicant, RSPB, councils and the Wildlife Trusts (and any other interested parties) to ensure that there is adequate provision for Stone-curlew.	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant welcomes the advice from Natural England and has further engaged with Natural England in preparing its DCO application. The Applicant has had regard to Natural England's advice regarding the character of the proposed stone curlew habitats. This is discussed and the rationale is set out in Section 5.3.6 of Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Appendix 8M: HRA to Inform and Appropriate Assessment and Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	If works are to take place outside of the bird breeding season there should be no direct impacts to the birds or Breckland SPA during construction; if they are planned between March and September we will need to see an Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) with details of how disturbance to the birds will be avoided. You will also need to consider how to avoid disturbance during operation (it is not clear how the panels will be managed) and during decommissioning. Taking all this into account, Breckland SPA also needs to be included for further evaluation in the Ecology report and also included within Table 8 of the Ecology report.	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential for the Scheme to impact upon breeding birds and the Breckland SPA in all phases of the Scheme. This has built upon the work outlined in the PEIR and the proposed mitigation to be employed by the Scheme is set out in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP, 16E Framework DEMP and 16F the Framework OEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Scheme's potential impacts on the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) are set out in Chapter 8 of the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	In our view there is currently insufficient detail on both the proposed location of the application around Fenland Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Chippenham Fen National Nature Reserve and Ramsar site and on potential effects to the site. Due to this lack of detail, it has been difficult to assess whether there is a likely significant effect to these sites due to this application and we expect a much greater level of detail to be included at the next stage of the process. Taking this into account, these sites should all be screened in for further assessment in Table 8.	Natural England	No	The Applicant has provided further information about the Scheme boundary as part of its DCO application. Further details can be found in the Land Plans [EN010106/APP/2.1]. The Applicant has continued to engage with Natural England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has included assessment of the Fenland Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Chippenham Fen National Nature Reserve and Ramsar site. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and its Report to inform Appropriate Assessment (Appendix 8L) [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is not entirely clear from the maps exactly where the solar panels are to be located around Chippenham Fen and, following a discussion with a member of the Parish council, we understand that further discussions will be needed with local landowners to establish where the panels can be located. In the next submission it would be helpful to ensure there is a clear map showing exactly which fields will house the panels, and where the panels, battery and drains will be located. If you need to find a new location for the panels, note that much of the soil adjacent to Chippenham Fen is peat, which we would expect to flood in winter.	Natural England	No	The Applicant has provided further information as part of its DCO application. This includes updated parameter plans which are available to view in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] and figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Chippenham Fen RAMSAR site is notable for its wetland invertebrate assemblage yet the submitted documents do not look in detail or make reference to any published research regarding the potential for operational impacts on the adjacent European Site. For example, there is no evidence that consideration been given to Natural England's Evidence Research (2017) which discusses the potential for aquatic invertebrates to confuse reflected polarised light from the panels for water. Although the conclusions of this paper advised that the effect of solar panels on aquatic invertebrates was as yet unestablished, it is nevertheless still a concern and therefore should not be ruled out from further assessment. Likewise, research is still undecided about whether wetland birds are significantly affected by	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has considered the impact of the Scheme on the Chippenham Fen RAMSAR and considers that the Scheme will have no adverse impact. The Applicant has also considered Natural England's Evidence Research (2017) in preparing its Scheme proposals. Based upon this assessment, wetland invertebrates are not expected to be adversely affected. Further details can be found in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Neither Wicken Fen nor Chippenham Fen Ramsar (the two closest sites to the Scheme) are designated for populations of waterbirds (designated for habitats / plants). The Scheme is not surrounded by, or close to, large bodies of water (lakes / reservoirs) that would support significant populations of waterbirds and therefore the Scheme is not (or very unlikely to be) on any migratory corridors for birds (e.g. where large numbers of birds may be commuting between such sites). Furthermore, the wintering and breeding birds did not record large aggregations of waterbirds (very small numbers only that were using some of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	solar panels i.e. they mistake them for water and therefore waste energy or injure themselves by mistaking panels for water bodies. Given this application is next to a Ramsar site, this should also be given further coverage at the next stage.			small agricultural waterbodies and ponds). This has been considered in Chapters 8 and 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Insufficient detail has been included to rule out air quality impacts during the construction, operation or decommissioning phases. We understand that there will be a barrier that will be used to protect the designated sites from dust pollution, but it is not clear whether the effects to air quality created by increased large vehicle usage around the designated sites has been considered. We are not clear how many vehicle visits are intended i.e. is that 13 vehicle visits per day or for the specific construction period? What will be the procedure for day to day management of the application site? There does not appear to be an air quality assessment within the submitted documentation that concerns air pollution due to transport in close proximity to designated sites i.e. in relation to Nox compounds.	Natural England	No	The Applicant has provided further details about the potential impact of the Scheme on air quality during construction. This includes an assessment on the potential risks to air quality in designated ecology sites. This is outlined in Chapter 14 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The air quality assessment concludes that, with mitigation, the effect on air quality in the vicinity of designated ecology sites would be low risk. Mitigation measures to minimise emissions and dust during construction are provided in Appendix 16C Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has considered the impact of construction traffic on air quality, the number of anticipated vehicle movements per day is approximately 700 (AADT - the majority of which is staff cars). Further information is provided in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We note it is intended to use lighting during the operation of the site. This would be detrimental to crepuscular and nocturnal bird and bat species that are known to forage around Chippenham Fen, such as Stone-curlew, and so we would not recommend this in a previously dark area. We would question why it would be needed during the construction period (if you are intending to use it during this time), when it is intended to avoid works in the bird breeding season.	Natural England	Yes	The Scheme will not be lit, with the exception of security lighting at the Battery Energy Storage System and compound locations. However, during operation of the Scheme this will be motion detected and only required when undertaking maintenance. Dark corridors for crepuscular and nocturnal species will be maintained. By avoiding works during the breeding bird season (i.e. March to October), daylight hours will be shorter and lighting may be needed in the earlier and later hours of the working day during construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There is potential for direct damage to floral or invertebrate species associated with the designated sites during the above phases, or disturbance of bird species during the construction phase, during management of the site in the operational phase, and during decommissioning.	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the potential of the Scheme to impact upon floral and invertebrate species during the Scheme's construction, operations and decommissioning. Accordingly, the Applicant has carried out a comprehensive environmental impact assessment. Where the Scheme is judged to have a significant impact upon sensitive receptors, the Applicant is proposing mitigation. The results of the assessment and the mitigation proposed are set out in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] but in summary, no significant effects have been identified to floral or invertebrate species.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We would advise that areas with peat soils should be enhanced to form the proposed wetland area, and would welcome further enhancements in terms of increased connectivity of the habitats within and around Chippenham Fen	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has continued to work with Natural England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has sought to provide increased connectivity between the habitats in and around Chippenham Fen. Further details can be found in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	On the basis of information provided, Natural England's advice is that this proposed development is likely to require measures intended to avoid or reduce the likely harmful effects on European sites which cannot be taken into account when determining whether or not a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a site and requires an appropriate assessment (following the People Over Wind ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union). For this reason, we advise that on the basis of the information supplied that the application may have a likely significant effect on the sites. These measures therefore need to be formally checked and confirmed by the competent authority, via an appropriate assessment, in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has continued to work with Natural England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has sought to mitigate any impacts that the Scheme may have on nearby European sites. A Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment accompanies the DCO submission which has taken an approach to mitigation that is consistent with the People over Wind ruling. Further details can be found in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	(as amended). These measures, and any additional measures that can avoid or reduce any likely harmful effects, can be considered as part of the appropriate assessment, to determine whether a plan or project will have an adverse effect on the integrity of the European site.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Overall there is a lack of clarity concerning potential effects to nationally protected species and habitats and how it is intended to mitigate for their loss.	Natural England	No	The Applicant has continued with its assessment activities following the statutory consultation and has provided a full summary of the Scheme's likely impacts on ecological receptors within Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and concludes there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The comments also all apply to Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Poor's Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Chippenham Fen National Nature Reserve (NNR).	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has had regard to Natural England's comments submitted through the statutory consultation and considered them in relation to Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Poor's Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Chippenham Fen National Nature Reserve (NNR). The Applicant has continued to engage with Natural England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has made changes to the Scheme proposals including: Further information is provided in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and summarised in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which concludes that there will be no significant effects to these habitat sites.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We welcome the habitat survey and protected species assessment, which details which protected species surveys are necessary for this application. However, it appears that the Ecological report has not included the recommendations of the ecological surveys i.e. it has not carried forward all the protected species surveys that were recommended. Given the scale of the application, and the number of different species and habitats within it, we recommend that the section on protected species is revisited, so that all recommendations from the surveys are included within the ecology report.	Natural England	No	In response to feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has ensured that all the ecological surveys are presented as Technical Appendices to the ES and that all recommendations have been taken forward into Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and have been captured in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP), Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2] that have also been submitted with the application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	After reviewing the ecology chapter we are no clearer on how much supporting habitat for notable breeding bird assemblages is likely to be lost and what exactly the 'land embedded within the scheme design' is. It is important to understand the detail (where it is, the type of habitat on site, whether it is proposed to have the mitigation land close to recreational areas or panels etc). We appreciate that we are at an early stage, but it is not possible to rule anything out at this stage without further detail on what will be provided for them.	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on breeding bird assemblages and has found the impact to be not significant. The proposed mitigation habitats are located throughout the Scheme and include the planting of native grasslands and trees, re-enforcement of hedgerows and offsets/margins alongside existing boundary features. Further information is provided in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2] and summarised in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Where specific birds have been listed, as in paragraph 8.9.16 of the PEIR which details temporary loss of habitat for breeding quail, hobby and little ringed plover, but then explains no more about it. We are left struggling to understand both the effect and whether the 'significant' areas of grassland habitat' that are to be retained will have any effect on them at all.	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on breeding birds and has found the impact to be not significant. An assessment on the temporary loss of habitat and disturbance to specific bird species has been undertaken. The proposed mitigation habitats are located throughout the Scheme and include the planting of native grasslands and trees, re-enforcement of hedgerows and offsets/margins alongside existing boundary features. These will be managed in line with a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP). Further information is provided in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and summarised in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is not possible to assess losses when the losses have not been adequately quantified. For example, how much acid grassland and semi-improved grassland will be lost and for how long? How is it intended to restore it? We find the same ambiguity with the sections on the loss of semi-improved calcareous grassland and arable habitat supporting notable arable flora, marshy grassland and invertebrate species. We appreciate that this is at an early stage of the DCO application, but without knowing how much is being lost, the time period it will be lost and further details concerning the plans to replace lost habitats (timing, area, management), it is very difficult to draw conclusions as to the effect this DCO application is likely to have on priority habitats and notable species. All the habitats above are important for a range of	Natural England	Yes	The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7]. Habitat for stone curlew in ECO1 and ECO2 (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will be created prior to construction. The internal cables within Sunnica East Site A will need to cross the Lee Brook in two places. Non-intrusive drilling techniques will be used to install cables underneath the bed of this watercourse, as well as 20 additional watercourses and ditches assessed to have sensitive habitats and species for cable crossings throughout the Order limits. This will avoid the need to excavate trenches through the watercourses. Trenchless techniques will require a launch pit to be excavated at the starting point for the machinery to drill from and a reception pit to be excavated at the end point where the machinery will drill to. These pits will be dug to a minimum distance of 10m from watercourses to avoid disturbing the margins and channel.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	species, including the bird species mentioned above. For example, the application is likely to affect species within habitats at the crossing point at the river Lark and has potential to affect species within Lea brook. Lea Brook runs through the area designated for East Site. There is an abundance of species within these waterbodies for which there are local records, including golden ringed dragonfly, alderfly and ramshorn snail.			Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The documents on farmland birds is lacking detail in terms of both the species covered and the plans for mitigation. For example, due to local records, we are aware that the fields in and around location E05 and E01,3 and 4 in Sunnica East Site A have been used by several declining or scarce farmland bird species over a number of years. These include corn bunting and yellow wagtail, with the latter known to be present most years. It has been noted within local records that Stone-curlew have been present in the area in at least three out of the past six years. We appreciate that initial ideas have been put forward to mitigate for effects to farmland birds, but more detail needs to be provided for the effect to be properly assessed.	Natural England		The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on farmland birds and this is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. With the Scheme's embedded mitigation, no adverse effects are predicted to farmland birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	If you take the case of bats, there is evidently a county level population of bats on site, as reported in the ecology report. In that case we would expect all lighting across the application site, where bats are likely to be present, to be preferably off at night but if necessary low/downward facing lighting. In accordance with Bat Conservation Trust best practice advice. Yet the PEIR reports that there is not a significant effect due to the mitigation set out in the CEMP, which we find contains nothing on lighting at all.	Natural England	No	The Applicant has included a Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] within its DCO submission which includes details of construction lighting and minimising impacts on bats.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	Residents are very concerned about the size and operation of the Lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) included in the scheme. Very limited information presented during the webinars implied these systems would, taken together, be the largest such installation in Europe and possibly worldwide. In spite of tens of pages of information about the solar panels, the only semi-technical information about the BESS is provided on three pages in PEIR Chapter 3, Scheme Description. This cannot be considered sufficient detail to assess the impact of the BESS, especially as the storage capacity is not even provided.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant believes that it provided adequate information through the PEIR and consultation materials to facilitate meaningful statutory consultation. Specific design details relating to the BESS element of the Scheme were not available at the time of preparing the PEIR, the Applicant therefore assessed a realistic worst-case impact by assessing a maximum footprint, which a common approach to take to ensure potential environmental effects are not under reported. The Applicant has provided further information on its proposals for the BESS as part of its DCO application in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In relation to the safety of the BESS, the Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This strategy has been developed in consultation with the local fire authorities. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	Several responses from Statutory Consultees shown in the Scoping Opinion, e.g. West Suffolk Council, raise the issue of the need to control dust during any construction work. However, the PEIR Chapter 14 Air Quality assessment notes the risk as "low to medium" for amenity and human health receptors, and the effect on respiratory conditions does not appear to have been considered.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The impact on human health is taken into account within the risk assessment process. Human receptors are of high sensitivity. However, the existing PM ¹⁰ concentrations in the area are low, and there are very few receptors within 20m of the Order limits. The combination of these factors mean that the risk of impacts is low. In addition, due to the close proximity of ecological sites the overall risk of impacts from the construction phase is high - and as such the highest level of mitigation measures are proposed, which will ensure there are no significant off-site impacts. An assessment of air quality effects of the Scheme is provided in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Mitigation measures to control air quality during construction are provided in Appendix 16C Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The BESS technology is stated to be lithium-ion. However, lithium-ion covers a broad range of battery chemistries. Given the differing characteristics of each, this is an insufficient description of the technology to allow proper assessment even under the "Rochdale Envelope" regime.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed a maximum footprint for the BESS within the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant believes that it provided adequate information through the PEIR and consultation materials to facilitate a meaningful statutory consultation. Specific details, including lithium-ion chemistry type, were not available at the statutory consultation stage given that the design was still evolving and responding to both the outputs of the environmental assessment work and consultee responses. This is a common approach to take to ensure potential environmental effects are not under reported. It is important that the Applicant is able to maintain sufficient flexibility in its design to be able to make use of developments in technology between the submission of the application and detailed design which will occur subject to the Applicant receiving development consent. The Applicant has provided further information on its proposals for the BESS element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm as part of its DCO application. Further information has been provided

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The Scheme could significantly affect the health, safety and wellbeing of residents and the wider community. The Scheme is proposing to use no less than 78 acres of land for three Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) using Lithium-ion based batteries. Such systems are known to be prone to thermal runaway and can cause fires and explosions. The hydrogen fluoride fumes emitted during such fires are extremely hazardous to human life. There have already been fires of this nature in Liverpool and Leicester. Such facilities are currently banned in Arizona and your own webinars confirmed that it is impossible to say what constitutes a "safe distance" for the BESS in relation to residential areas.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant takes the fire risk posed by the BESS element of the Scheme very seriously and has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and BESS Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report presented in Appendix 16D of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Plan has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this plan will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the plan. An BESS Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report is provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.2]. This concluded that, in the unlikely event that a fire were to break out in a single cell or module it is very unlikely, given the control measures, that the fire would spread to the rest of the BESS. Even should all the systems fail and a large scale fire break out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	Although possible contamination from leaked Cadmium is perhaps deemed low it is none the less a risk, particularly if a large number of panels become damaged either during construction, operation or even or decommissioning. Such contamination would affect protected water supplies and local rivers. The proposed development site runs over a groundwater Source Protection Zone which is used for public water supply.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Scheme will have an Environmental Management Plan in place for the operation and maintenance of the Scheme. This will include measures to regulate the environmental effects of the operational phase of the Scheme including measures to manage the risk from pollution from small leaks and spillages from proposed maintenance activities. A Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) is provided within Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Environmental Management Plan will include a schedule for regular visual inspection of the PV modules. Through observation of any structural defects in the PV modules the Applicant will be removed. The modules are constructed in a robust manner and their components cannot be separated except with a considerable mechanical load. Therefore, the risk of any liquid leakage from the modules is very low. Details of the Embedded mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	We believe that the proposed scheme contravenes West Suffolk Council Joint Development Management policy DM14 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered policy DM14 in preparing this DCO application. The Applicant's assessment of the Scheme against relevant planning policy is provided in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. The Applicant considers that the proposals comply with policy DM14 for the following reasons: Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents the potential for effects on the water environment during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. This outlines that there are likely to be no significant adverse effects on water quality, water resources or physical characteristics of the water environment. Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] concludes that there will be no permanent significant adverse noise effects from construction and decommissioning works noise on local receptors. Cumulative effects from the operational noise affecting the nearest receptors at Burwell are considered to be limited to minor adverse. Chapter 14: Air Quality of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				concludes that there are anticipated to be no significant adverse effects on air quality as a result of the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	If an accident does occur, how will emergency services safely access any injured persons in remote areas of the sites? It will not be possible for MAGPAS to safely land the emergency helicopter on a sea of silicon and metal.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has set out its proposals for managing access to the site during construction in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3] and the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has considered the need for emergency access during the Scheme's operating life providing alternative access to the BESS areas. A number of site accesses will remain open throughout operation and two will remain available as dedicated access points for emergencies. In addition, there will be areas of hardstanding within the Site for car parking/laydown and large areas of ecological mitigation with short grass cover that have the potential to be utilised in an emergency situation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The fumes given off in these fires contain highly toxic hydrogen fluoride. When consumed at high levels, this gas can lead to death, at lower levels it goes quickly and easily through the skin into the body tissues.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report is provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This concluded that, in the unlikely event that a fire were to break out in a single cell or module it is very unlikely, given the control measures, that the fire would spread to the rest of the BESS. Even should all the systems fail and a large scale fire break out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	Sunnica has not provided any mitigation plans with regards to safety and Cambridgeshire and Suffolk Fire and Rescue have not been consulted.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant consulted with the fire authorities during the consultation and again subsequently. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report presented in Appendix 16D of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Plan has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this plan will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	We do not consider the level of information provided in the consultation documentation is sufficient to provide any meaningful consultation on the BESS and associated infrastructure. We note an enquiry from a member of the public to the Applicant noting the insufficiencies in the specifications provided and setting out 18 questions to "complete the minimum information needed for a meaningful Consultation". The questions cover capacity, fire risk and mitigation, technology, design codes, safety standards and the application of COMAH regulations to the site.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed a maximum footprint for the BESS. The Applicant believes that it provided adequate information through the PEIR and consultation materials to facilitate a meaningful statutory consultation. Specific details, including detailed design, were not available at the statutory consultation stage given that the project was still evolving and the Applicant responding to both the outputs of the environmental assessment work and consultee responses. This is a common approach to take to ensure potential environmental effects are not under reported. The Applicant has provided further information on its proposals for the BESS element as part of its DCO application. This information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In relation to the safety of the BESS, the Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This plan has been developed in consultation with the local fire authorities and a copy has

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				been sent to the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to receiving development consent, the Applicant will update this plan following the final project design and prior to it beginning operations. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The BESS site on Elms Road in Freckenham is close to residential development and schools in Red Lodge. Lithium-ion batteries of all chemistries are known to present safety concerns, with reports of a recent fire in a small installation in Liverpool. BESS fires in Arizona US and Korea have led to government agencies suspending the use of these systems, and the cumulative risk of having such large numbers of batteries in one place is alarming many residents who can find no references to any safety standards such as COMAH in the consultation documentation.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the safety of the BESS in combination. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This plan has been developed in consultation with the local fire authorities and shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy. Under present regulations, the Applicant would not be required to register the BESS facilities with COMAH. The Applicant is nevertheless committed to ensuring the safe operation of the BESS and will continue to engage with the local authorities on this matter. An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report is provided in Appendix 16D of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This concluded that, in the unlikely event that a fire were to break out in a single cell or module it is very unlikely, given the control measures, that the fire would spread to the rest of the BESS. Even should all the systems fail and a large scale fire break out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	At the beginning of October 2020, we understand that Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service had not been consulted on the scheme, but are nonetheless intending to respond to the Statutory Consultation. We expect that the site would be registered under the COMAH regulations, in common with other local businesses handling or making use of hazardous materials.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the safety of the BESS, The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This plan has been developed in consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service). The plan has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy. The plan includes details relating to operations. Under present regulations, the Applicant would not be required to register the BESS facilities with COMAH. The Applicant is nevertheless committed to ensuring the safe operation of the BESS

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				and will continue to engage with the local authorities on this matter.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	We are very concerned by the Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) expected to be formed of lithium ion batteries, approximately 17,550 cubic metres of them. These devices are known to be subject to relatively high risk of fire and explosion especially as they age. Any fire will cause severely toxic fumes. At least one American state has banned their use for energy network storage. A recent explosion and fire in Liverpool reportedly involved such a device. We are unconvinced by the rambling expressions as to how these installations will be managed, how they will be maintained and how they will be safely disposed of. Clearly-written Standard Operating Procedures should be drafted. CPRE are particularly concerned for the safety and visual amenity of the residents of Burwell if the	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the safety of the BESS, The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This plan has been developed in consultation with the local fire authorities and shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy. The plan includes details relating to operations. Under present regulations, the Applicant would not be required to register the BESS facilities with COMAH. The Applicant is nevertheless committed to ensuring the safe operation of the BESS and will continue to engage with the local authorities on this matter. An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	existing National Grid installation were to be further expanded. The Health and Safety Executive should be involved in assessing all aspects of the risks to health, safety and the environment that these installations will pose.			Report is provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This concluded that, in the unlikely event that a fire were to break out in a single cell or module it is very unlikely, given the control measures, that the fire would spread to the rest of the BESS. Even should all the systems fail and a large scale fire break out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population. The Applicant has considered the impacts of the National Grid substation extension at Burwell as part of its environmental impact assessment activity. Further details in relation to the expected visual impact of the extension can be found in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity and Chapter 15: Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The Joint Response from SCC/CCC/WSC/ECDC notes that the modelling of electric fields is not included in the PEIR, and requests that it is reported. We believe that the local health authorities (Primary Care Trusts and Care Commissioning Groups) should also be involved in disaster planning and monitoring for any long-term health effects of the scheme, so that residents' health can be assured. If the scheme was designated a COMAH site, as noted above, this would happen automatically. This is made more important by the close proximity of the BESS compounds to residential areas, for example those on Bridge End Road, Elms Road, Isleham Road, and the proximity of the primary schools in Red Lodge.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant has consulted with local Care Commissioning Groups as part of the statutory consultation. The Applicant has considered the impact of electromagnetic fields on human health and has consulted with Public Health England in relation to this point at the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping stage. The impact of electromagnetic fields on human health was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and this approach was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate at the scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm did not present any significant risk to human health. Further information is available within the Scoping Opinion, Appendix 1A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Public Health England did not raise a concern with this approach when consulted on the scoping report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Sunnica say their solar energy scheme will have 78 acres of Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS). The batteries used will be lithium ion batteries, which are known to be unstable. How will the local communities be protected from these potentially lethal batteries?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the safety of the BESS, The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This plan has been developed in consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service). The plan has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy. The plan includes details relating to operations.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The lithium ion batteries are susceptible to thermal runaway causing fires and explosions, such as that on Carnegie Road, Liverpool on September 15th 2020. They have been banned in US states such as Arizona due to the unacceptable risk they pose.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant takes the fire risk posed by the BESS element of the Scheme very seriously and has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report presented in Appendix 16D of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Plan has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy. An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report is provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.2]. This concluded that, in the unlikely event that a fire were to break out in a single cell or module it is very unlikely, given the control measures, that the fire would spread to the rest of the BESS. Even should all the systems fail and a large scale fire break out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	Never in the UK has there been BESS's proposed on this scale and so close to villages.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant recognises the safety concerns relating to the BESS element of the Scheme and takes the risk of fire very seriously. The Applicant takes the fire risk posed by the BESS element of the Scheme very seriously and has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report presented in Appendix 16D of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Plan has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report is provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This concluded that, in the unlikely event that a fire were to break out in a single cell or module it is very unlikely, given the control measures, that the fire would spread to the rest of the BESS. Even should all the systems fail and a large scale fire break out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	Residents suffering from lung conditions such as asthma and COPD having their physical illnesses compounded by construction and transport related dust. This includes the loss of highly valued rural views and use of footpaths and other green spaces will have a detrimental impact on the emotional wellbeing and both physical and mental health of residents. The Covid-19 pandemic for example has highlighted the importance of green spaces and accessible countryside for positive mental health and well-being.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the risk of dust and particulate matter impacts during construction in Chapter 14 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], and the effect of this on Human Health in Chapter 15. The Applicant's assessment concludes that during construction, earthworks and Scheme construction activities will result in dust emitted in an area up to 350m away from the Order limits. This area includes residential properties within Burwell, Snailwell, Isleham and Worlington and a number of non-motorised user facilities including PRowS and bridleways. However, due to low background particulate matter concentrations in the area, the impact of these dust emissions is assessed to have a low risk to human health. In addition, due to the close proximity of ecological sites the overall risk of impacts from the construction phase is high, and therefore the highest level of mitigation measures are proposed, which will ensure there are no significant off site impacts. Mitigation measures to control dust emissions during construction are provided in Appendix 16C Framework Construction

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed landscape and visual impacts on human receptors and has sought to reduce the potential effects of the Scheme through embedded mitigation which has been built into the Scheme design. Visual and landscape impacts on well-being does not form part of the guidance on which the scope of Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] is based. Therefore, landscape and visual impacts on well-being were not scoped into the human health assessment. However, Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses the effect interactions on receptors. Landscape and visual effects on the well-being of local residents has been considered as part of this assessment in-combination with other effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The dust given off through construction could be bad for people living with lung conditions including asthma and COPD.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the risk of dust and particulate matter impacts during construction in Chapter 14 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], and the effect of this on Human Health in Chapter 15. The Applicant's assessment concludes that during construction, earthworks and Scheme construction activities will result in dust emitted in an area up to 350m away from the Order limits. This area includes residential properties within Burwell, Snailwell, Isleham and Worlington and a number of non-motorised user facilities including PRowS and bridleways. However, due to low background particulate matter concentrations in the area, the impact of these dust emissions is assessed to have a low risk to human health. In addition, due to the close proximity of ecological sites the overall risk of impacts from the construction phase is high, and therefore the highest level of mitigation measures are proposed, which will ensure there are no significant off site impacts. Mitigation measures to control dust emissions during construction are provided in Appendix 16C Framework Construction

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The stress caused by this proposal for locals is huge due to battery dangers, housing prices falling and a noisy and disruptive construction phase.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant recognises that construction activity can be disruptive and has the potential to impact upon local communities. The Applicant has assessed the likely impacts of construction and provided details of its proposals to avoid or mitigate adverse effects in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Where significant impacts have been identified, the Applicant is proposing mitigation that is also outlined in the Framework CEMP. With regard to the proposed battery energy storage system (BESS), the Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report presented in Appendix 16D of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Plan has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this plan will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the plan. Based on experience, the Applicant has not found proximity to solar to depress house prices.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The well-being of residents will also be affected by the fact that none of the proposed sites are near major routes, which will also lead to: ▪numerous road closures & diversions ▪muddy conditions and increased risk of traffic accidents ▪damage and disruption to local communities	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the impact of the Scheme on the local road network and set out its proposals to access the Scheme during construction and operations in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) [EN010106/APP/6.2], submitted as part of the DCO application. This has been developed through consultation with the local highways authorities. The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed with Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CTMP and TP in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed during construction. No significant effects from construction traffic have been identified. A Framework CEMP has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The parish council is concerned as to the risks of the battery storage, fire risk and health effects especially being located close to residential properties.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Applicant has considered the safety of the BESS, The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This plan has been developed in consultation with the local fire authorities and shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Subject to the Scheme receiving development consent, this strategy will be updated following detailed design, and requires the approval of the relevant planning authorities prior to the beginning of construction of the BESS. The relevant planning authorities are required to consult with the Health and Safety Executive, and Fire and Rescue Services before determining whether to approve the strategy. The plan includes details relating to operations. An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems Report is provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This concluded that, in the unlikely event that a fire were to break out in a single cell or module it is very unlikely, given the control measures, that the fire would spread to the rest of the BESS. Even should all the systems

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				fail and a large scale fire break out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The Scheme would cause the loss of highly valued rural views and use of footpaths and other green spaces will have a detrimental impact on the emotional wellbeing and both physical and mental health of residents. The Covid-19 pandemic for example has highlighted the importance of green spaces and accessible countryside for positive mental health and well-being.	Isleham Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the importance of the landscape through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (see Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]). This assessed the Scheme's impact on the landscape from a variety of viewpoints and where a significant impact has been identified, mitigation is proposed. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has made a number of design changes including: - Further setting back from Worlington by removing parcels E11 and E23 from PV module development. These parcels now form part of area ECO3 shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] - Removing parcel E07 from solar development to mitigate impact on the landscape between Freckenham and Isleham. This parcel now forms area ECO2 also shown in Figure 3-1. - Incorporating further setbacks at E33 to reduce the Scheme's visual impact from the surrounding roads. - Removing parcels W13, W14 and W16 (shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) from the Order limits and incorporating further setbacks

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				at parcel W15 (shown in Figure 3-2). Further information can be found in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]. All existing PRow within the Scheme boundary will be retained and will remain accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRows would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary; the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users. The Scheme proposes new permissive routes; indicative locations (subject to final agreement with the landowners) are Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	There is one major hazard accident site within the DCO application boundary. This major accident site is: HSE reference H3161.	Health and Safety Executive	No	The Applicant is grateful for the Health and Safety Executive's feedback.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	There are a number of major accident hazard pipelines including: 8219 2486 Cadent Gas Ltd Great Wilbraham / Burwell 7452 1710 National Grid Gas PLC 3 Feeder Roudham Heath / Great Wilbraham 7444 1703 Cadent Gas Ltd Burwell / Ely 7399 1658 Cadent Gas Ltd Mildenhall Reinforcement 7398 1657 Cadent Gas Ltd Burwell / Wess house 7397 1656 Cadent Gas Ltd Ness House / Freckenham	Health and Safety Executive	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with a number of consultees following the statutory consultation, including National Grid Gas and Cadent Gas. This engagement has assisted with the development of the Scheme design to ensure appropriate setbacks from the infrastructure are provided alongside suitable access. The Applicant has been in detailed discussions with National Grid and Cadent and is negotiating protective provisions with those parties for the protection of their pipelines. Further information is provided in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The Scheme boundaries illustrate where populations may be present e.g. offices and warehouses. None of these are within any of the above zones; therefore, providing there are no major changes to the locations of populations HSE would not advise against this proposal.	Health and Safety Executive	No	The Applicant welcomes the feedback from the Health and Safety Executive and has continued to engage following the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) will probably require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended. HSC would be required to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances at or above the controlled quantities set out in Schedule 1 of these Regulations. Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.	Health and Safety Executive	No	The Applicant welcomes the feedback from the Health and Safety Executive and has continued to engage following the statutory consultation. Where required, Hazardous Substances Consent will be sought and managed by the contractor prior to the start of construction. The Framework CEMP Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] outlines measures required for the safe management of hazardous substances in order to protect human and environmental receptors during construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	The overall risk to non-motorised users (NMUs) and the impact on active travel should be considered on a case-by-case basis, accounting for the number and type of users and the effect increased vehicle activity will have on their journey and safety. Evidence must be provided on existing usage of the PRow and the local road network for walking, cycling and horse riding, which needs to be utilised within the IEMA GEART methodology.	Public Health England	No	The Applicant has considered the risk to non-motorised users and considered current usage of PRow in the area in Appendix 13B Transport Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted with its DCO application. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRows would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Diversion routes will be identified and signs indicating those routes provided for all users. Effects on users of PRow likely to be affected by closures (i.e. all PRow located in or within 500m of the Order limits) have been considered. Potential significant adverse residual effects have been identified on users of two PRows during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Temporary closures of PRows will be for

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				no longer than 3 weeks. No other significant effects were identified. For detail, see Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use within the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human health	We note that electromagnetic fields have been scoped out of the Environmental Statement (ES) and have not been addressed in the PEIR. We, therefore, recommend to the promoter that they confirm that the electrical equipment associated with the site will not have a public health impact as detailed in the guidance provided in the PHE scoping response.	Public Health England	No	The Applicant has considered the impact of electromagnetic fields and consulted with Public Health England at the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping stage. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of our Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and this approach was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England did not raise a concern with this approach when consulted on the scoping report. The high voltage cables associated with the Scheme have been sited within agricultural fields and away from residential areas where residents would be exposed. Therefore, it is considered that EMFs will not have a public health impact.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	CPRE are particularly concerned by the effect of this development on the B1085 Dane Hill Road and Station Road. This forms the only link for many miles for villages to the south and east of the B1506.	Fordham Parish Council	No	Due to the working hours proposed the staff are expected on the local highway network between 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00 and therefore outside of the traditional highway peak hours. Further information can be found in Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Appendix 13B Transport Assessment, and Appendix 13C Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Newmarket Road across the railway to the A11 northbound. The railway bridge is old and weak and is width restricted. The roundabout in Kentford is a recognised bottleneck. No account seems to have been taken of the fact that this road will be made considerably busier by the construction of 500 houses with access onto this road.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant is aware of the proposals for Kennett Garden Village coming forward in close proximity to the Order limits. The Applicant's assessment of transport impacts has taken account of that development.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The route of the closed Cambridge-Mildenhall railway has been identified as a heritage asset. There seems to be no awareness of the long term ambition of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Forest Heath District Council to reconnect Mildenhall to Cambridge with the planned Cambridge Autonomous Metro. If these plans are funded, there is the very real possibility that the old route of the railway could form a preferred route for the Metro.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has engaged with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority following the statutory consultation to discuss proposals for the Scheme in relation to the Cambridge Autonomous Metro.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Any traffic counts and assessment should also, as far as reasonably practicable, identify informal routes used by NM users and potential routes used due to displacement. Usage data should be through, a combination of traffic counts, visual inspection, and information provided by the local community and the local authority. Where mitigation measures are required, e.g. temporary diversions, these must be identified and reported in the final ES. Any temporary diversions must be designed to maximise continued usage and minimise perceived or actual barriers to access. Closure of any PRow must be accompanied by a detailed justification.	Public Health England	No	The Applicant has carried out a full assessment of the potential impact of the Scheme on the local highway network, providing data on non-motorised users and on the potential usage of alternative routes through displacement. Traffic survey data has been identified in the Transport Assessment. The results of these assessments and the mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant are set out in Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment presented in Appendix 13B [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The proposed scheme requires a cable to cross Network Rail's operational infrastructure between Fordham and Snailwell. The location of the proposed crossing is detailed within the Scheme Boundary Drawing, which forms part of the consultation booklet. The Applicant will need to continue to engage with Network Rail in relation to this aspect of the scheme. An Asset Protection Agreement is required to be signed before proceeding with any design or construction work alongside, above or below Network Rail's infrastructure. Prior to any development/construction or alterations to the site by the Applicant, further site specific safety requirements, engineering technical approval and detailed conditions will need to be sought from Network Rail's Anglia Asset Protection	Network Rail	No	The Applicant welcomes Network Rail's feedback through the statutory consultation and has continued to engage with Network Rail following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. The Applicant's negotiations with Network Rail on protective provisions and related agreements are ongoing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	team. The process for obtaining approval is outlined on Network Rail's web page.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Network Rail have standard protective provisions which will need to be included in the DCO as a minimum. Further engagement is required on this. In addition, a number of legal and commercial agreements will need to be entered into, for example, asset protections agreements, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements and all other relevant legal and commercial agreements. This list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed once more details of the scheme are discussed between the parties.	Network Rail	No	The Applicant welcomes Network Rail's feedback through the statutory consultation and has continued to engage with Network Rail following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. The Applicant's negotiations with Network Rail on protective provisions and related agreements are ongoing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The small villages and country lanes will be badly affected during the construction process and are not designed to cope with high volumes of large construction vehicles. The council are concerned about damage to verges, mud on the road from the fields which in itself increases accident risk due to skidding and increased risk to pedestrians, especially as many roads do not have footpaths. How will Sunnica protect local people?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant recognises the potential for construction traffic to impact upon local roads and is proposing to carry out highway condition surveys to assess the condition of the roads before and after construction. As outlined in Section 6.2 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The roads that would be subject to such surveys will be discussed with the local highway authorities before the beginning of the examination, if it is accepted, with a view to reaching agreement before the examination closes. The CTMP will be secured by way of a requirement to the DCO The Applicant is proposing that wheel washing facilities will be provided – this is detailed within Section 6 of the Framework CTMP and TP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and a measure is included within Appendix 16C: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. As detailed in Appendix 13B: Transport Assessment of the ES

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, there are no issues of highway safety arising as a result of the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Scheme. The Applicant expects that construction staff would be using the local highway network between 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00 and therefore outside of the traditional highway peak hours. Further information can be found in Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Appendix 13B Transport Assessment, and Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Please be aware that any land transfer, easement etc will need to go through Network Rail's clearance process and other rail industry processes.	Network Rail	No	The Applicant welcomes Network Rail's feedback through the statutory consultation and has continued to engage with Network Rail following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. The Applicant's negotiations with Network Rail on protective provisions and related agreements are ongoing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The response from Suffolk County Council notes that there has been no engagement with Suffolk Highways on construction traffic planning. The Joint Response from SCC/CCC/WSC/ECDC notes that the modelling in the Construction Environment Management Plan is flawed. We note that the modelling of staff vehicle numbers relies on significant car sharing (ratio 1.5) however no justification as to how this would be achieved is made, it simply appears to be a device to reduce the number of vehicles.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant has engaged with the highways authorities for Suffolk and Cambridgeshire alongside Highways England in preparing its Scheme proposals. The car share ratio is based on previous experience in Suffolk on a DCO application with further information provided within Appendix 13B Transport Assessment and Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Locations away from the A11 such as East A are generally inaccessible for the volumes of HGV traffic forecast, with routes using C and U class roads to access site entrances. The draft traffic management plan shows Heavy Goods Vehicles using Elms Road for the main access point to East B on a section currently closed to HGV, past a point that measures just 4.5 metres from kerb to kerb. Significant upgrades to the northbound Red Lodge junction from the A11, and Elms Road, would be required to allow HGV to access the BESS compound at E18 on Elms Road, with Elms Road being strengthened and provided with proper kerbside surface drainage in the same way as the B1085 quarry access has been improved. Similar improvements would be required on other roads around East A.	Freckenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has engaged with the highways authorities for Suffolk and Cambridgeshire alongside Highways England in preparing its Scheme proposals. This has informed the development of the Applicant's Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B [EN010106/APP/6.2] and the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The TA should be carried out in accordance with Policy laid out in Department for Transport Circular 02/2013, Transport analysis guidance (TAG) and Highways England's protocol on dealing with planning applications. The Transport Scoping Note states that any mitigation to the SRN will be DMRB compliant. Any such mitigation should be discussed with Highways England at the earliest of opportunity.	Highways England	No	The Applicant welcomes Highways England's engagement through the statutory consultation and has further developed its assessments of transport impacts while having regard to the guidance cited. The results of the Applicant's assessments relating to transport and its proposed mitigation are included in Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Appendix 13B Transport Assessment and Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan, and Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	It appears that 2 bridges owned by the Department for Transport may be affected: Isleham Bridge and Four Cross Ways.	Department for Transport	No	The Applicant acknowledges the potential of the Scheme to impact upon Isleham Bridge and the bridge at Four Cross Ways. The crane routes have been reviewed based on the weight limit of the Isleham Bridge. Further details are provided in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Detailed proposals are required for the proposed construction of entry/exit points as shown in the Construction Management Plan para 2.2.19 figure 2.5 access points for HGV at E,F,G. onto rural class C & B roads.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has provided details of the site accesses including visibility splays, swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The DCO site is near the A11 and A14 crossing county boundaries. There are no committed or pipeline maintenance or improvement schemes being undertaken in the locality of the proposed site on the A11 or A14 that need consideration from a Sunnica Energy Farm perspective (at the time of writing).	Highways England	No	The Applicant notes Highways England's comments on this matter.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Sunnica West (South) and Sunnica East (the most easterly section) have potential for glint and glare issues on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) due to their close proximity. A Glint and Glare Assessment has been included. This refers to the need for mitigation on the A14 due to the classification of the network, but not on the A11. Further detail could be provided by the applicant to confirm this. The report concludes that the potential solar reflections will be mitigated by significant vegetation screening. Figure 1 in this document appears to have greater number of panel sites, including G, compared to that shown in the Transport Scoping Note.	Highways England	No	The Applicant has provided additional detail as to why glint and glare mitigation is not required on the A11 in a Glint and Glare Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. As is noted in that assessment, the modelling was carried out on an earlier design iteration that is greater in scale than that proposed in the DCO Application. The results of the Glint and Glare Assessment are therefore conservative.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	It is agreed that the construction phase is the only phase that needs to be considered in full detail in the TA. HGV routing for the construction phase has only been provisionally detailed at this stage. The preliminary proposal is to assess the following junctions only on the SRN: A11 Off Slip / B1085 Dane Hill priority 'T' junction; and A14 / A142 Fordham Road (Junction 37) Further discussions are needed in this regard, the A11/A14 junction is not proposed for assessment.	Highways England	No	The Applicant welcomes Highways England's engagement through the statutory consultation and has further engaged with Highways England in developing its assessments. The results of the Applicant's assessments relating to transport is included in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in Appendix 13B Transport Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Further discussions are also needed with regard to traffic volumes, as the proposed construction phase trip generation is substantial and could have significant effect on the SRN. Further detail should also be provided regarding the assumptions of peak hours for the traffic assessment, as the detail is scant, and feels unrealistic, as to the 06.00-07.00 AM peak and 19.00-20.00 PM peak. (These proposed construction staff peak hours are reiterated in 2.2.24 of the CTMP). Without a more thorough methodology to justify these peaks then the highway network peak hours should be used to form a robust assessment.	Highways England	No	The Applicant welcomes Highways England's engagement through the statutory consultation and has further engaged with Highways England in developing its assessments. As a result of the working hours proposed by the Applicant, Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Appendix 16C Framework CEMP, Appendix 13B Transport Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2], are based on the staff arriving between 06:00-07:00 and departing 19:00-20:00 and sets out the measures that would be implemented to prevent staff movements on the network during network peak hours.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	HGV routes are shown on the draft traffic management plan as bi-directional, with multiple vehicles per hour, hence there is a significant chance of HGV meeting one another as they travel to and from Sunnica East A using the C and U class roads. The HGV routes include "Four-cross bridge" beside enclosure E10, which may well be unsuitable for the proposed level of HGV traffic.	Freckenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The drawings showing the HGV routes have been updated to show single direction on each plan. HGV movements will be managed in line with the information provided in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan and Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	We will also need confirmation if any connecting cables will cross our network. There does not look to be need to cross due to the proposal to connect to Burwell National Grid substation, but confirmation needs to be given either way as the Transport Scoping Note mentions that the exact routes have not yet been confirmed. However, if Sunnica West site G is part of the proposal then presumably cabling will need to cross the A11, and the Transport Assessment Appendix H: Access Study details 3 High Voltage connection corridors across the A11.	Highways England	No	The Applicant is proposing to install cables across Highways England's network underneath the A11 at Kennett. The Applicant has continued to engage with Highways England following the statutory consultation on the terms of appropriate protective provisions for its undertaking.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The proposed access route to be made just before the railway bridge on the West Row to Freckenham Road, is proposed virtually on a blind corner. The use of 'Golf Links Road' in the Transport Plan, is completely unsuitable for HGV traffic, and as a single track, it is completely unsuitable for heavy traffic volume. The Parish Council has raised the poor condition and unsuitability of the Golf Links Road with SCC Highways for the past 5 years, and the road is already struggling and severely damaged with the traffic volumes currently.	Worlington Parish Council	Yes	The Applicant has engaged with the highways authorities for Suffolk and Cambridgeshire alongside Highways England in preparing its Scheme proposals. This has informed the development of the Applicant's Transport Assessment within Appendix 13B [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The site access has been revised and will either be from the southern end of Golf Links Road or from Newmarket Road. The Applicant has considered the impact of the Scheme on the road network including Golf Links Road, and the safety of its access points with further information provided in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan, and Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed with Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which concluded that there would be no significant adverse

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				effects during construction on Golf Links Road.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	There should be no access to any part of a build programme along the B1085 which has a weak rail bridge with 3T weight limit.	Kennett Parish Council	No	A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] has been produced which identifies the HGV routes and considers the weight limits of local bridges.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Locations away from the A11 such as West site B are generally inaccessible for the volumes of HGV traffic forecast, with routes using C and U class roads to access site entrances. The draft traffic management plan shows Heavy Goods Vehicles using Fordham Road for the access point to West A on a section currently closed to HGV over 7.5t. and Chippenham Road for the access point to part of West B with a link road between the two sites crossing Fordham Road.	Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant has engaged with the highways authorities for Suffolk and Cambridgeshire alongside Highways England in preparing its Scheme proposals. This has informed the development of the Applicant's Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B [EN010106/APP/6.2] and the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	HGV routes are shown on the draft traffic management plan as bi-directional, with multiple vehicles per hour, hence there is a significant chance of HGV meeting one another as they travel to and from Sunnica West A using the C and U class roads. The HGV routes possibly through Snailwell are unsuitable for the proposed level of HGV traffic. The 7.5t weight limit to commercial traffic was enacted principally for environmental reasons.	Snailwell Parish Council	No	The drawings showing the HGV routes have been updated to show single direction on each plan. HGV movements will be managed as part of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) and Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Many residents have noted the mental health effects of dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting employment and financial insecurity, and their attempts to find clear and straightforward information on the Sunnica proposal. All this has caused significant stress and feelings of hopelessness in the local community. Consequently, the view of the Parish Council remains that the consultation should have been postponed until 2021 when the matter could be considered by residents in more normal times.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) process is a fixed statutory process that requires us to consult which we have done through the statutory consultation and subsequent targeted consultation. During the statutory consultation we consulted, as required by the Planning Act 2008, the community as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2). We received a significant number of responses as demonstrated by the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1). The Applicant published a number of materials to facilitate the consultation including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included the preliminary results of the Applicant's environmental impact assessment activity. Subject to the Application being accepted for examination, there will be a further opportunity for interested parties to register and submit their feedback and be involved throughout the examination of the application. The Scheme is a NSIP that the Applicant is bringing forward to answer an urgent national need for renewable energy generation. The Government has

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				encouraged the development sector to continue to work during the COVID-19 pandemic to provide the future infrastructure that we all need. The Applicant therefore considers that it was appropriate to consult at the time that it did.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	We wrote to Sunnica with concerns about the consultation, in particular that in being online-only it excluded a significant proportion of residents in the area. Village life does not currently include "garden gate" conversations and other village events that people use to form views about complex issues like this scheme.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant acknowledged Freckenham Parish Council's concerns and met remotely with the members of the parish council to discuss these concerns during the consultation. The Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) [EN010106/APP/5.2] included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. The Applicant consulted in line with the SoCC. Further details are provided within the body of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Booklets and letters from the company have been delivered in plain white envelopes that did not include "Sunnica" on the outside, we suspect many were assumed to be unsolicited marketing materials and thrown away. Limited adverts for the scheme were taken in newspapers, in small print text. These are the same issues as raised in our response to the Non-Statutory Consultation	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant advertised the consultation in accordance with the methods identified within the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) which was prepared in consultation with host local authorities. The Applicant also went beyond these methods and placed further advertisements in local publications during the consultation period. These adverts were presented with similar font sizes to the text within the newspaper itself. In each case, a freephone telephone number was listed within the advert to enable anyone with an interest in the consultation to contact the project team directly. Further details of the Applicant's consultation advertisements are included within the body of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The parish council has concerns over the lack of consultation with the majority of this done online this has excluded a significant proportion of residents.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. The Applicant consulted in line with the SoCC. Further details are provided within Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The consultation booklet was produced with small text, included confusing and out-of-scale maps, and did not include simple facts such as the size of the parcels of land or the generating capacity of the solar panels and battery storage. Relevant facts were buried deep in the hundreds of pages of online documentation and not in the Consultation Booklet.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant produced a number of different consultation materials and provided means for consultees to contact the project team with questions or to seek further details through a dedicated freephone telephone number advertised in a letter sent to over 10,000 addresses in consultation zone 1, the consultation booklet sent to the same addresses, the Applicant's website and the webinars. The Applicant provided a briefing pack to local councillors and parish councils that invited them to get in touch in the event that they were aware of anyone who was having difficulty taking part in the consultation. The booklet invited consultees to contact the project team if they wanted hard copies of any of the consultation materials. Where consultees requested maps in larger formats, the Applicant provided copies. The Applicant considers that the consultation brochure provided an appropriate, non-technical, overview of the scheme. The Applicant consulted in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2), further details of the Applicant's consultation activity can be found in the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1] and the Applicant's consultation materials

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				can be found in the Consultation Report Appendices [EN010106/APP/5.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Due to COVID-19 we have been unable to have face-to-face discussions with Sunnica. This is despite other National Infrastructure Projects within Cambridgeshire carrying out public consultation events in Wisbech.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant advertised the consultation in accordance with the methods identified within the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) which was prepared in consultation with host local authorities. The SoCC included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. Further details are provided within Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	A printed copy of the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report supplied to the Parish Council, contained only the main chapters in the document and not the appendices available online. During poorly-attended webinars requiring pre-registration and held at inconvenient times, Sunnica admitted that the telephone consultation line had not been very busy, unsurprising as the telephone number is located in small text on the last page of the Consultation Booklet.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant provided hard-copies of the core chapters of the PEIR to parish councils who requested them on a voluntary basis in addition to the consultation activity detailed within the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) [Appendix D-2]. The Applicant consulted in line with the activity outlined in the SoCC (which was prepared in consultation with host local authorities) including supplementary activity during the consultation extension such as additional webinars. The consultation booklet was designed in a way to ensure that it was accessible and to promote engagement in the consultation. The freephone telephone number was not only provided on the consultation booklet but also in the accompanying covering letter sent to over 10,000 addresses in consultation zone 1, the letter detailing the Applicant's extension to the consultation also posted to all of the addresses in consultation zone 1, on the Applicant's website and on the banners provided to local parish councils on request during the consultation. In addition to this, the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				freephone number was also promoted during the consultation webinars. The Applicant received a significant number of responses as demonstrated by the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1). This included 725 individual responses from the community. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity can be found in the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1]

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The Webinars Sunnica have set up to have to speak to locals are at anti-social hours for example 6pm on weekdays and 2pm on weekends.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant held 15 webinars in total during the consultation. These included six topic-specific webinars that were each held twice to give consultees an opportunity to attend a second event if they could not attend the first one. The topic-specific webinars were scheduled either for 2:00pm on Saturdays or 6:00pm on Thursdays. The Applicant held three additional webinars following the extension to the consultation, each of these was held on a Wednesday evening at 7:00pm. Each webinar was recorded and made available on the project website. One webinar recording broke, and the Applicant transcribed answers to each question answered and uploaded this as a pdf document with the recording to compensate for the lack of recorded content. The Applicant does not consider the range of times to be during 'anti-social hours'.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	On these webinars you have to type your questions to them, there is very little room for genuine discussion and debate.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted in line with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) which was developed through consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant prepared the SoCC in line with the latest best practice to provide opportunities for consultees to engage remotely through a variety of means. During the webinars, the Applicant answered as many questions as it could. This included extending the time of webinars to take additional questions and publishing responses to any questions that could not be answered during the webinars on its website.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Large amounts of locals' questions have gone unanswered when emailed to Sunnica. When pressed on this Sunnica blame COVID and say staff are having to work from home. However, they will not recognise these difficulties when they are brought up by locals.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant responded to a large number of enquiries during the statutory consultation, some of which were very technical in nature and required specialist input, this meant that some enquiries required more time to form a response than others. The Applicant considers that it responded to all enquiries it received during the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	No outside party is overseeing this Statutory Consultation. All emails and questionnaires go directly back to Sunnica and will not be seen by another party. This may lead to a lack of impartiality or at the very least gives the appearance of such. How can we be protected from this? How do we know Sunnica will accurately reflect the concerns of locals? Again, this points to the lack of transparency in the consultation process.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has had regard to all consultation responses that it received, as demonstrated by the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1] and this appendix which will be published should the Scheme be accepted for examination. When deciding whether or not to accept the application, the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State, will decide whether or not the Applicant's consultation activity has been adequate. As a result of its consultation activity, the Applicant is proposing a number of changes to the Scheme design including: • Removing areas bordering the south of Worlington from solar development. This has increased the distance between the solar sites and homes. • Removing areas between Isleham and Freckenham from solar development. Alongside land to the south of Worlington, these areas are now proposed for use as mitigation habitats. These areas are marked ECO1, ECO2 and ECO3 on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				• Moving the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) proposed at Sunnica East further away from Ferry Lane to mitigate its visual impact. • Proposing new permissive routes to improve connectivity between settlements.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica's Preliminary Environmental Impact Report still leaves many vital questions unanswered (number of batteries, battery capacity, how they will achieve a net biodiversity gain, business rates they will pay etc) so how are we meant to be able to effectively scrutinise and comment on the scheme when so many questions remain unanswered?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant considers that it provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback to the consultation. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included a comprehensive scheme description, was necessarily preliminary in nature, reflecting the fact that consultation was undertaken at a time to enable feedback to influence the scheme the subject of the application. As is established practice, the Applicant assessed the Scheme's impact according to Rochdale Envelope method of assessing the maximum parameters, meaning that a worst-case scenario for the impacts of the Scheme has been assessed in the PEI Report and the Environmental Statement. It is established practice that detailed design only be finalised prior to commencement of construction. Finalisation of the detailed design will be secured by a requirement in the DCO, which will require approval by the relevant planning authority of the detailed design in accordance with documents submitted as part of the DCO Application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The questionnaire provided by Sunnica for feedback is very confusing and gives very little room for constructive criticism. The first question divides the two sites up, making it difficult to comment on the size of the scheme, which was the largest concern of local people reported to Sunnica in the pre-consultation. The second question is about the cable route which again remains largely unconfirmed. Agreements with landowners to cross their land have not been reached, although Sunnica is now threatening to use statutory powers to gain access. Question 3 is about 'Environmental Impacts' which is discussed over 860 pages of the PEI Report,	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant considers that the consultation questionnaire provided an appropriate means of collecting responses. This is reflected in the number and detail of the responses that the Applicant received. Details of the responses and how the Applicant has had regard to them are included in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1] and this appendix. This includes an analysis of the responses received. It is important to note that the consultation questionnaire was just one method of responding to the consultation, a large number of consultees chose to submit comments in writing. The Applicant considers that it has provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback to the consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	how can they generalise this to just one question? How will the questionnaire feedback data be analysed and reported given that it is not in a quantifiable format? The consultation should include all sites of scientific or natural interest and highlight conservation areas.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The lack of any physical consultation events remains a concern for us. We were able to run an "Awareness Stall" displaying laminated scheme maps printed at A2 in a Covid-safe environment at several outdoor Farmers Markets in the area. Visitors indicated they felt unable to access this basic understanding of the scheme from anywhere else, and had not understood they might request large print maps for themselves.	Freckenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. The letter posted with the consultation booklet and the subsequent letter explaining the extension to the consultation both provided contact details to get in touch with the project team if any further information was required. In addition to this, the Applicant promoted the consultation freephone number and the opportunity to book telephone appointments in newspaper adverts, through the webinars and the consultation information pack sent to parish councils and local councillors. The Applicant consulted in line with the requirements of the SoCC, which was prepared in consultation with the host local authorities. Further details are provided within the body of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The lack of any physical consultation events is a concern for us. It excluded residents in the area.	Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. The Applicant consulted in line with the requirements of the SoCC, which was prepared in consultation with the host local authorities. We received a significant number of responses as demonstrated by the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1). This included 725 individual responses from the community. Further details are provided within the body of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Anecdotal reports of long delays in receiving answers to questions submitted to the enquiry email address are still being received. We are monitoring these enquiries.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant responded to a large number of enquiries during the statutory consultation, some of which were very technical in nature and required specialist input, this meant that some enquiries required more time to form a response than others.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Given the long-term nature of the scheme and the current situation with Covid-19 and Brexit, the Parish Council asked Sunnica to delay the consultation until residents have the capacity to consider the Scheme properly. It feels that the consultation is being pushed through while people are concentrating on their health and livelihoods and "looking the other way".	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted in line with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) which was developed through consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant prepared the SoCC in line with the latest best practice to provide opportunities for consultees to engage remotely through a variety of means. The Applicant also extended the consultation period by two weeks, in part in view of the enhanced public health measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic adopted by the Government at a national level from 5 November 2020 until 2 December 2020. The Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) that the Applicant is bringing forward to answer an urgent national need for renewable energy generation. The Government has encouraged the development sector to continue to work during the COVID-19 pandemic to provide the future infrastructure that we all need. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				received, the Applicant therefore considers that it was appropriate to consult at the time that it did.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica East Site A was added to your application at the last minute and despite repeated requests you completely failed to undertake any direct dialogue with Isleham residents prior to the start of this official consultation period (the initial consultation was undertaken prior to the inclusion of East Site A which most affects our village). You also refused to share maps and other associated information which has restricted our own engagement with residents and has resulted in many residents still being unaware of the full implications of your proposal. This also prevented informed responses to be made to your consultation.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant revised the Scheme design following the non-statutory consultation. This was, in part, as a result of the feedback received during the non-statutory consultation. The non-statutory consultation was an informal consultation held by the Applicant to identify important issues at an early stage and to raise awareness of the Scheme locally. The Applicant's consultation activity during the non-statutory consultation included an event in Isleham, a letter publicising the consultation was posted to addresses in Isleham and Isleham Parish Council was notified of the consultation. Further information on the non-statutory can be found in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report. It was not possible to share updated maps prior to the start of the statutory consultation as the Applicant's design was still evolving and it was not possible to present such interim designs with appropriate context. It is not the view of the Applicant that the early publication of such plans would have enhanced engagement. During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted in line with the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) and extended the consultation period to run between 22 September 2020 and 18 December 2020. The Applicant considers this to be an adequate time frame to make an informed response to the statutory consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation. This included 725 individual responses from the community. Of the responses that gave a postcode, 90 of these were from Isleham. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity are provided within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The Applicant has treated local residents with complete contempt by refusing direct dialogue, to address any previously raised concerns in your proposed application, or to answer a wide range of questions raised by residents during your Webinars.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. During the webinars, the Applicant answered as many questions as it could. This included extending the time of webinars to take additional questions and publishing responses to any questions that could not be answered during the webinars on its website. The nature of some questions meant that it was not possible to give a full response during the statutory consultation as the proposed design was still evolving and the environmental information presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) was preliminary in nature. This is common practice during statutory consultation and does not represent a refusal by the Applicant to answer questions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The Applicant has made a number of changes to its proposed scheme in light of the feedback received through the statutory consultation. This includes: • Removing areas bordering the south of Worlington from solar development. This has increased the distance between the solar sites and homes. • Removing areas between Isleham and Freckenham from solar development. Alongside land to the south of Worlington, these areas are now proposed for use as mitigation habitats. These areas are marked ECO1, ECO2 and ECO3 on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. • Moving the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) proposed at Sunnica East further away from Ferry Lane to mitigate its visual impact. • Proposing new permissive routes to improve connectivity between settlements. Further information on our proposals as submitted can be found in Chapter 3:

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant consulted in line with the requirements of the SoCC which was prepared in consultation with host local authorities. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation. Further details are provided within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	It is disappointing to find that amongst responses to this Statutory Consultation, we are raising the same questions as we did in our response to the Non-Statutory Consultation. We believe that the issues raised and lack of responses to previous enquiries mean that the proposal does not provide opportunities for local communities to influence decisions that affect us, as described in Principle number three of UK Solar PV Strategy Part 1: Roadmap to a Brighter Future.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	During the statutory consultation, Applicant consulted in line with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) which was developed through consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant prepared the SoCC in line with the latest best practice to provide opportunities for consultees to engage remotely through a variety of means. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity are provided within Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1]. The Applicant has made changes to its proposed scheme in light of the feedback received through the statutory consultation, including from the local community. These changes include: • Removing areas bordering the south of Worlington from solar development. This has increased the distance between the solar sites and homes. • Removing areas between Isleham and Freckenham from solar development. Alongside land to the south of Worlington, these areas are now proposed for use as

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				mitigation habitats. These areas are marked ECO1, ECO2 and ECO3 on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. • Moving the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) proposed at Sunnica East further away from Ferry Lane to mitigate its visual impact. • Proposing new permissive routes to improve connectivity between settlements. Further information on our proposals as submitted can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Details of how the Applicant's regard to comments received during the consultation has influenced these changes can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Covid has provided an excuse to cancel meetings and avoid consultation. Attendance at early non-statutory consultation meetings proves how passionate our communities are on such matters. We would suggest that this consultation period should have been delayed until after Covid when physical consultation meetings could have taken place, ensuring full awareness of the proposals and enabling informed responses to be made.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. The Applicant also extended the consultation period by two weeks, in part in view of the enhanced public health measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic adopted by the Government at a national level from 5 November 2020 until 2 December 2020. The Applicant consulted in line with the commitments made within the SoCC which was prepared in consultation with host local authorities. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a high level of participation. Further details are provided within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The consultation has failed to provide accurate visual representations ie "Type 4 visualisations" of the changes that would result to viewpoints etc Such visualisation are one of the few ways that people can really appreciate the changes that would be made to areas and views they're familiar with.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant provided a number of different visualisations within the PEIR during the statutory consultation. The Applicant considers the information provided within the PEIR to have been sufficient to have facilitated meaningful consultation on the Scheme proposals. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity are provided within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The webinars have been poorly advertised, require IT skills and are not held at a convenient time for many families.	Isleham Parish Council	No	During the statutory consultation, Applicant consulted in line with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) which was developed through consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant prepared the SoCC to provide opportunities for consultees to engage remotely through a variety of means. This included a number of measures to allow those without internet access to engage with the consultation, these included direct mailout of a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in the area around the Scheme, and the opportunity to hold a booked telephone conversation with members of the project team. The Applicant held 15 webinars in total during the consultation. These included six topic-specific webinars that were each held twice to give consultees an opportunity to attend a second event if they could not attend the first one. The topic-specific webinars were scheduled either for 2:00pm on Saturdays or 6:00pm on Thursdays. The Applicant held three additional webinars following the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				extension to the consultation, each of these was held on a Wednesday evening at 7:00pm. Each webinar was recorded and made available on the project website. One webinar recording broke, and the Applicant transcribed answers to each question answered and uploaded this as a pdf document with the recording to compensate for the lack of recorded content. The first 12 webinars were advertised through promoted Facebook posts and the Applicant's website. The consultation booklet, covering letter and newspaper adverts all promoted the consultation webinars and asked consultees to visit the project website or to call the Freephone telephone number for further information. The additional three webinars were promoted through the letter detailing the extension to the consultation. This was issued to over 10,000 addresses in consultation zone 1. The Applicant considers its quantity, timing and advertisement of the webinars sufficient to have enabled interested parties to have engaged with them.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				In the event that anyone had difficulty accessing the webinars the Freephone number was available to enable support from the project team. Anyone who was unable to access the webinars was able to use the Freephone number to book a one-to-one telephone or virtual meeting appointment with the project team where they could raise any questions that they had. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity are included within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Not all houses in Isleham received consultation booklets. It was down to the village action group to establish and access additional copies.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant issued copies of the consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses within the vicinity of the Scheme. This was undertaken via a mailing service and included all addresses in consultation zone 1, an area covering at least one mile from the boundary of the Scheme boundary at that time. This included the village of Isleham. This Applicant also provided a number of copies on request. In addition to this, the Applicant also issued letters detailing the consultation extension to the same mailing area. This provided details of the Freephone number and email address and encouraged recipients to get in touch if they had any questions or wished to access more information. The Applicant consulted in accordance with the commitments made within the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2). The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation. This included 725 individual responses from the community. Of the responses that

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				gave a postcode, 90 of these were from Isleham. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity are included within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Some residents experienced difficulty in reading maps in the consultation booklet.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant produced a number of different consultation materials and provided the means for consultees to contact the project team with questions or to seek further details through a dedicated freephone telephone number advertised in a letter sent to over 10,000 addresses in consultation zone 1, the consultation booklet sent to the same addresses, the Applicant's website and the webinars. The Applicant provided a briefing pack to local councillors and parish councils that invited them to get in touch in the event that they were aware of anyone who was having difficulty taking part in the consultation. The booklet invited consultees to contact the project team if they wanted hard copies of an of the consultation materials. Where consultees requested maps in larger formats, the Applicant provided copies. The Applicant considers that the consultation brochure provided an appropriate, non-technical, overview of the scheme. The Applicant consulted in accordance with the Statement of Community

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2), further details of the Applicant's consultation activity can be found in the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1] and the Applicant's consultation materials can be found in the Consultation Report Appendices [EN010106/APP/5.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica failed to include in their documentation the existence of other solar farms in the area. For example, we already have 11 large solar covering 1200 acres with a further 7 sites either awaiting construction or under review, all within a 15-mile radius of the affected area.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant considers the level of detail provided within its consultation documents to have been sufficient to facilitate meaningful consultation on the Scheme proposals. The materials published for the statutory consultation included a summary of cumulative effects (including other solar farms) in Chapter 17: Effect Interactions of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report). This has been updated following the statutory consultation and a summary of existing infrastructure is given in Chapter 17: Effect Interactions of the Environmental Statement EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity are provided within the body of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	It is essential that the developer has meaningful dialogue with the local authority and local residents to fully understand the local impacts, effects and agreement on mitigation measures.	Public Health England	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of consultation with the local community and undertook a statutory consultation in accordance with the commitments made within the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2). The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a high level of participation. Further details of the Applicant's consultation activity are provided within the body of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Sunnica is stating that the whole scheme will be built in two years. What confidence is there in achieving this timescale considering there has been no detailed construction plan submitted?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The current expectation is that site preparation, construction, and commissioning of the Scheme will take approximately 24 months, however, there is the possibility that the construction will be phased and the overall period could therefore be longer. The Applicant has assessed the potential impacts of the Scheme relating to construction and is proposing mitigation in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be updated subject to the Applicant receiving development consent, and prior to the start of construction, to account for the Scheme's final design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	In due course HE will need to work with the Applicant to agree the initial Construction Transport Management Plan and elements of the Construction and Environmental Management Plan, as well as the Travel Plan for the construction phase. It will be necessary to develop a Statement of Common Grounds ahead of examination period for the project and finally have discussions about the Draft DCO for the project.	Highways England	No	The Applicant welcomes Highways England's engagement through the statutory consultation and has continued to engage with Highways England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. A Statement of Common Ground will be developed prior to the examination period, following submission of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Due consideration should be given to waste management during the construction phase of the development. With regards to any potential import and re-use of soils we refer to our Groundwater Protection Position Statement J8. Excavated material will need to be appropriately managed and its suitability for re-use will need to be demonstrated. If any materials are to be reused on site, we expect them to be appropriately characterised. Similarly, any soil material that will be disposed of off-site we also need to be appropriately characterised. If the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (DoWCoP) is to be followed, a Materials Management Plan will be required to be produced specifying what information must be gathered and documented.	Environment Agency	No	The Applicant has considered waste management within Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and is outlined in the Framework CEMP and Framework DEMP in Appendices 16C and 16E respectively of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The physical and mental health and wellbeing of residents will be negatively impacted by two years of construction involving countless HGV lorries, abnormal loads and 1,260 staff working 12-hour days/ 6 days per week creating noise and disruption through our villages. We do not feel that impact of this traffic on local communities should be underestimated.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant recognises that construction activity can be disruptive and has the potential to impact upon local communities. The Applicant has assessed the likely impacts of construction and provided details of its proposals to avoid or mitigate adverse effects in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Where significant impacts have been identified, the Applicant is proposing mitigation that is also outlined in the Framework CEMP. The impacts of construction traffic and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are outlined in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Sunnica will deploy 1,200 staff on the sites and they will work from 7am till 7pm, Monday till Saturday. This will cause huge disturbance in the local neighbourhoods. How will we be protected?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant recognises that construction activity can be disruptive and has the potential to impact upon local communities. The Applicant has assessed the likely impacts of construction and provided details of its proposals to avoid or mitigate adverse effects in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Where significant impacts have been identified, the Applicant is proposing mitigation that is also outlined in the Framework CEMP. The impacts of construction traffic and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are outlined in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The parish council is concerned at the impact of construction on infrastructure, traffic and disruption.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Applicant recognises that construction activity can be disruptive and has the potential to impact upon local communities. The Applicant has assessed the likely impacts of construction. Where significant effects have been identified, the Applicant is proposing mitigation. The mitigation measures proposed during construction are detailed within Chapter 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction. A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]), which details the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				traffic management measures to be adopted during construction to minimise impacts on the local road network. A Design and Access Statement has also been submitted as part of the DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	We understand that it is not considered possible to avoid crossing Havacre Meadows and Deal Nook CWS during the laying of the cable route. Given that this is a site valued at county level and rich in biodiversity, we recommend avoidance where at all possible, via more detailed micro-siting of the cable route. We are not clear how it is intended to tunnel under the site, as no details appear to have been included. We recommend that you consult the Wildlife Trust before you make any plans concerning works on this site, as they will be able to tell you the best place to cross the site (assuming you are not able to avoid it entirely, which of course would be preferred).	Natural England	Yes	It will not be possible to avoid crossing the County Wildlife Site (CWS), however, non-intrusive methods, such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD), will be employed. Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted with the DCO includes details of construction methods for crossing Havacre Meadows and Deal Nook CWS.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The link between the PEIR document and the CEMP is confusing. In several instances, the PEIR rules out significant effects due to the measures set out within the CEMP to protect species, habitats and designated sites, but then the CEMP does not contain adequate mitigation to do this. For example, in terms of Chippenham Fen, effects during construction are considered not significant due to the CEMP, but then we find that in neither document is it clear where exactly the panels will be located, let alone where the lighting will be or how many people will be on site during construction, maintenance and deconstruction.	Natural England	No	The Applicant has updated the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] following the statutory consultation following further engagement with a number of stakeholders, including Natural England and following completion of its environmental assessments. The Applicant has provided a full summary of its environmental impact assessment (EIA) activity within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of its DCO application. Some details, such as the exact position of the PV modules, are the subject of detailed design and it is not possible to provide precise details as the Scheme will seek to use the latest technology in its final design. To ensure that the Scheme's EIA is robust, the Applicant has assessed the maximum impact of the Scheme by using the 'Rochdale Envelope' method of assessment. It is established practice that detailed design only be finalised after submission of the DCO Application. Finalisation of the detailed design will be secured by a Requirement in the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	No	The Applicant has had regard to the advice provided by National Grid, and National Grid Gas has developed its Scheme proposals in accordance with the relevant guidance notes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The CEMP states, in relation to noise, that 'Best Practicable Means will be applied, as far as is reasonably practicable'. In our view, this does not actually mean anything and certainly there is nothing there that one could be held to account for. We recommend that the approach within the PEIR and CEMP needs to be revisited. Firstly, the evidence should all be set out within the Ecology report. Hence if the reason that there is not likely to be a significant effect to bats is because specific habitats, trees and ponds used for breeding and foraging are to be retained, and bat friendly lighting will be used, then you need to say all this in the PEIR, not refer to a separate management plan. Anything that is included within the CEMP and is being relied on to decide significance should	Natural England	No	The Applicant has updated the assessment presented within the PEIR following the statutory consultation following further engagement with a number of stakeholders, including Natural England. The Applicant has provided a full summary of mitigation for ecology in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	be included within the PEIR document.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	We consider the proposals seriously underplay the construction activity. The U6006 is a quiet country lane linking Worlington and Red Lodge/Freckenham and must not in our opinion be used by construction traffic. It is well used by equestrians and should be retained as a green corridor, either side of the lane will be engulfed by the solar farm and the loss of amenity and outstanding views of open countryside is immense caused by fences either side of this 1.5-mile route.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant does not consider that it has 'underplayed' construction activity and has presented a full assessment of the impacts of construction in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and has proposed mitigation in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. U6006 would be crossed by construction traffic during construction. It is proposed that U6006 will close temporarily during construction. This would be closed for no longer than three weeks. Closures of PRowS are outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and presented in Figure 13-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of National Grid High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a National Grid representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude protective provisions to ensure the protection of National Grid and National Grid Gas' assets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Excavation works may take place unsupervised no closer than 3 metres from the pipeline once the actual depth and position has been confirmed on site under the supervision of a National Grid representative. Similarly, excavation with handheld power tools is not permitted within 1.5 metres from our apparatus and the work is undertaken with NG supervision and guidance.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude protective provisions to ensure the protection of National Grid and National Grid Gas' assets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of support") drawings can be obtained using the contact details above.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude protective provisions to ensure the protection of National Grid and National Grid Gas' assets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of National Grid High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a National Grid representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude protective provisions to ensure the protection of National Grid and National Grid Gas' assets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	With regard to cable crossings: •Cables may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees. •A National Grid representative shall supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline. •Clearance must be at least 600mm above or below the pipeline. •Impact protection slab should be laid between the cable and pipeline if cable crossing is above the pipeline •A Deed of Consent is required for any cable crossing the easement. •Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude protective provisions to ensure the protection of National Grid and National Grid Gas' assets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Larger fields increase the level of construction traffic, access issues and associated soil compaction from delivery vehicles. We believe that these issues mean that the proposal is not appropriately sited, as described in Principle number three of the UK Solar PV Strategy Part 1: Roadmap to a Brighter Future. It also goes against point 1 of the planning considerations laid out in the Guidance on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy.	Freckenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	We do not consider that the Scheme as presented is inappropriately sited. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for selecting land for the Scheme and is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land confirming the land selected is suitable for a large scale solar farm. A suite of specialist reports has been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include an assessment of construction traffic regarding the Scheme which is included within Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CTMP and TP in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed during construction. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction, including minimising impacts associated with soil compaction. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	With regard to pipeline crossings: •Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at previously agreed locations. •The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required. •The type of raft shall be agreed with National Grid prior to installation. •No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the National Grid pipeline without the prior permission of National Grid. •National Grid will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and National Grid Gas following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and is aiming to conclude protective provisions to ensure the protection of National Grid and National Grid Gas' assets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	protective measure. •The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to National Grid. •Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip. •A National Grid representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with National Grid specification T/SP/SSW22. •A Deed of Consent is required for any crossing of the easement			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	We would ask that a standard set of actions be implemented whilst any underground cable is being installed, such as signposted diversions of rights of way, a minimum closure time etc.	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Yes	The Applicant welcomes the feedback. A standard set of actions would be implemented throughout construction of the Scheme. The appointed Contractor would manage diversions and closures of roads and PRow. The measures to control disruption to the local network are outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Will fences be properly maintained so as to prevent wandering children and bored teenagers from entering an exciting enclosure humming with electrical energy?	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant takes the issue of security seriously and has considered this within its proposal. More details as to the types of perimeter fencing to be provided around each type of infrastructure can be found within Chapter 3 - Scheme Description [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In terms of security normally the perimeter fencing of the plant is sufficient as this has CCTV and only qualified personnel can enter in the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. During its operating life, the Scheme will be subject to regular inspections and maintenance.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The parish council is concerned at the potential noise impacts and risks of the battery storage element of the Scheme.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operations. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The mitigation measures are set out in the Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application can be found in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be updated subject to the Applicant receiving development consent and following the final design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. With regards to the design of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), no significant effects have been identified and no mitigation measures beyond the embedded design has been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The potential damage to panels and subsequent pollution into the ground from material deterioration, storms, birds and vandalism. The monitoring of such enormous number of panels over such a large expanse of land could not be undertaken by the minimal number of staff proposed post construction.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Scheme will have an Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) in place for the operation and maintenance of the Scheme. This will include measures to regulate the environmental effects of the operational phase of the Scheme including measures to manage the risk from pollution from small leaks and spillages from maintenance activities. The OEMP will include a schedule for regular visual inspection of the PV modules. Through observation of any structural defects in the PV module the Applicant will be removed before there is any leakage of chemicals from the sealed units. The OEMP will be based on the Framework OEMP provided in Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Given this is one of the first of these very large solar farms across the UK, we expect that, if this application were to receive planning permission, all monitoring data shall be fed into the public domain and this application should provide lessons learnt for other large scale solar projects across the UK. It should be prepared to act as a site for research, such as concerning habitats and flora under and around panels, or invertebrates or birds collision risk, for example.	Natural England	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with Natural England following the statutory consultation and welcomes the opportunity to work with Natural England in providing research opportunities during the operating life of the project. Details of the Applicant's current proposals for the management of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can be found in Appendix 10I Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be updated subject to the Applicant receiving planning consent and the final design of the project.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	During the operational phase there is a potential risk to groundwater from small leakages of chemicals from the solar panels. Regular inspection and maintenance of these structures is key to reducing the likelihood of this occurring. Permanent structures containing oil, e.g. transformers, fuel/oil storage tanks, should be provided with the appropriate level of secondary containment (see above link to guidance on oil storage) which is regularly inspected, and any spillages or leaks dealt with as soon as possible. Spill kits should be provided in these areas and staff should be trained on what to do in the event of a spillage/leak.	Environment Agency	No	The modules are constructed in a robust manner and their components cannot be separated except with a considerable mechanical load. Therefore, the risk of any liquid leakage from the modules is very low. Details of the Embedded Mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A fully functional PV module is not toxic and does not present a danger to its surrounding environs. The Applicant does however recognise the potential for PV modules to be damaged and to leak. For this reason, the Applicant will put in place an OEMP to manage the site during its operating life. This will include a regime of regular checks to identify and fix any damage prior to their being any leaks from the modules. The Plan will also set out precautions to be followed during maintenance activities to minimise the risk of any leaks from the sealed units. The Applicant has prepared a draft version of this plan which can be viewed in Appendix 16F: Framework OEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The approval and implementation of the final plan is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The Scheme will create light pollution during its operation.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The amount of lighting during operation is minimal and best practice lighting design can mitigate light pollution. The impact of operational lighting has been assessed within Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement with no significant effects identified. [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) presents mitigation measures during the operational phase and is available in Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	CPRE are very concerned by the vague statements made concerning the removal of facilities and reinstatement of the sites, should they cease to operate. This is a further example of lack of compliance with Policy ENV 6 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. There are statements to the effect that panels and their frames will be removed and that the land can then be returned to agricultural use, but will a guaranteed decommissioning fund be lodged independently to ensure that there will be sufficient resources for this to happen in 40 years time? There is one rambling paragraph, 16.7.28, in the PEIR dealing with disposal and/or recycling of waste solar panels which states that there is "a new industry emerging for recycling solar panels". Reliance on such a vague aspiration that by the time the site ceases to	Fordham Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008, and is included in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant has submitted a Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] with the DCO Application which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. The creation of waste during decommissioning is considered in Chapter 16 of the Environmental [EN010106/APP/6.1] and so the effects of this has been considered in the Environmental Statement. Sunnica is committed to compliance with the waste hierarchy when decommissioning plant

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	operate, such an industry might or might not exist, cannot be relied on and is not acceptable. A clear, funded plan for the decommissioning, removal and recycling of the materials from these sites must be in place before their development is allowed to proceed.			used in the Scheme, and this includes both PV modules and batteries. Given that the Scheme is expected to operate for 40 years, it is not possible to say now exactly how decommissioning will take place and therefore Sunnica proposes to secure the provision of a DEMP, which will include a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan setting out how waste will be dealt with prior to the commencement of decommissioning. The framework DEMP includes proposals to ensure that waste disposal is carried out in accordance with the waste hierarchy and where waste disposal is unavoidable that it is responsibly disposed of.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The lack of a fully-funded bond also goes against point 3 of the planning considerations laid out in the Guidance on Renewable and Low-Carbon Energy. We note that the Joint Response from SCC/WSC/ECDC/CCC makes a similar point.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008. With these measures in place, we do not consider a bond to be appropriate or necessary.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Assumptions regarding the decommissioning phase assessment are reasonable in terms of detailed traffic assessment for 40 years' time, however detail of this phase of the development in terms of effect on the strategic road network should be included.	Highways England	No	The impact of the decommissioning stage on the strategic road network is expected to be less or equal to that discussed in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 13B Transport Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There is a lack of a proper decommissioning bond.	Kennett Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008. With these measures in place, we do not consider a bond to be appropriate or necessary.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	An alternative to restoring the site to farmland would be to restore an area to woodland. This would give Sunnica an opportunity to gain carbon credits and deliver benefits and natural capital to the local area.	The Forestry Commission	No	The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use, anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or DCO application, in the same way as housing or industrial uses require this consent now. It is proposed that ecological enhancement areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of this land and it may be returned to agricultural use.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The identified decommissioning proposals do not provide any specific details about how the approx. 154,000 solar panels will be recycled or how numerous tonnes of toxic waste will be disposed of without being a legacy for future generations.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 and is included in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant has submitted a Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] with the DCO Application which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. The creation of waste during decommissioning is considered in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Sunnica is committed to compliance with the waste hierarchy when decommissioning plant used in the Scheme, and this includes both PV modules and batteries.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Given that the Scheme is expected to operate for 40 years, it is not possible to say now exactly how decommissioning will take place and therefore Sunnica proposes to secure the provision of a DEMP, which will include a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan setting out how waste will be dealt with prior to the commencement of decommissioning. The framework DEMP includes proposals to ensure that waste disposal is carried out in accordance with the waste hierarchy and where waste disposal is unavoidable that it is responsibly disposed of.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Decommissioning is almost entirely omitted from the PEIR. This is an important aspect of the application, not only in terms of the direct effects that may occur during this period due to proximity effects, but also because you will need to consider what will happen to the land in question once the solar panels are removed.	Natural England	No	The Applicant will be required to decommission the Scheme at the end of its 40 year operating life in accordance with the conditions of any DCO. The Applicant has provided a Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] as part of its DCO application which secures this. The Applicant has submitted a Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] with the DCO Application. Given that the Scheme is expected to operate for 40 years, the DEMP will be updated prior to decommissioning to account for the latest technology including the recycling of PV modules. The habitat created in the Scheme will be left in place during and following decommissioning. Following decommissioning, the land will be returned to the landowners. At this point, the Applicant will no longer have a say in what the land is used for. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use, anything other than returning the land to its current

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				use would require a separate planning application or DCO application, in the same way as housing or industrial uses require this consent now.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The proposals do not include a sufficient enough financial bond for a project of this size and scale or include enough guidance as to how this bond might be distributed. In 40 years' time (or more likely earlier when the site is no longer economically viable) the operator, landowners or future generations of residents will be faced with clearing up this environmental mess.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008. With these measures in place, we do not consider a bond to be appropriate or necessary.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There has been no confirmation of how the vast cost of decommissioning will be met should the Sunnica Solar project become bankrupt. No detail has been provided as to how this will be financed. Please provide the detail. What happens if the scheme ends before the 40-year expected lifetime? When will the proposed fund have reached the required sum to facilitate the decommissioning of the scheme?	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008. With these measures in place, we do not consider a bond to be appropriate or necessary.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Commentary during webinars stated that a decommissioning bond would start to be funded from year 10 or 15, and only be fully funded in the later years of the scheme. However, if for some reason the farm required decommissioning during its expected life of 40 years, for example because it had been superseded by later technology and was uneconomic, then the burden of decommissioning might not fall on the company but on the local authorities. Please confirm how the decommissioning bond would address the cost of decommissioning during the life of the scheme, since once constructed the need to decommission the farm is an absolute risk. This compares to a contingent risk such as a fire event, which may be insured against.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008. With these measures in place, we do not consider a bond to be appropriate or necessary.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Land contamination investigations should be carried out in accordance with BS 5930:1999-2010 'Code of Practice for site investigations' and BS 10175:2011 'Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice' as updated/amended. Site investigation works should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced professional. Soil and water analysis should be fully MCERTS accredited. Any further site investigation, demolition, remediation or construction works on site must not create new pollutant pathways or pollutant linkages in to the underlying principal aquifer to avoid generating new contaminated land liabilities for the developer. Clean drilling techniques may be required where boreholes,	Environment Agency	No	A Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment (PREA) has been prepared for the Scheme. A Conceptual Site Model (CSM) was prepared with a view to identifying any potentially significant source-pathway-receptor linkages. This was followed by an environmental risk assessment. This has demonstrated that the residual effect of the Scheme is very low to low for identified receptors. The PREA it has been agreed with the Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) at the Local Authorities. Further information can be found in Section 16.4 of the Other Environmental Topics Chapter [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 16B [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	piles etc. penetrate through contaminated ground.			

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Freckenham Parish Council objects to the proposal. This position has been confirmed by a household survey during October 2020 when 96% of respondents indicated they were against the proposed scheme as described in the current Statutory Consultation.	Freckenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant accepts that not everyone is supportive of the Application. The Applicant has prepared its proposals having had regard to feedback received across both statutory and non-statutory consultations. This has meant that the Applicant's proposals have been shaped by feedback that it has received. Further information on how the feedback received as influenced the Scheme can be found in the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Application to answer a need for new sources of energy generation and has provided further details for this in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We support the findings of the four councils as presented in their joint response document.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant notes these responses from Freckenham Parish Council and Snailwell Parish Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	There is no business plan to demonstrate the financial robustness of this scheme.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has produced a Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] as part of its DCO application which demonstrates how it will fund the liabilities it will incur as part of the implementation of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Company fronting the application, Sunnica Ltd, have a negative balance sheet value of £317k. Information at Companies house suggests Sunnica Ltd is being backed by a large Spanish Solar business, Bosques Solares SL.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant and its constituent companies and consultants have an established tracked record of delivering projects of this kind. The Applicant's means of funding the project are set out in the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Sunnica does not have a track record of developments of this size, with the member companies generally installing projects below 50MW and no stated experience of the NSIP planning regime. This is demonstrated in the level of detail present in the PEIR, generally judged insufficient by the Joint Response from SCC/CCC/WSC/ECDC. There is a noted lack of engineering-level technical detail in the proposal, for example with no detail on the generating capacity of the panels or BESS, or the storage capacity of the BESS, precluding calculations about the environmental impact of the scheme, or on its noise impact. It also undermines any confidence in the draft Construction Environment Management Plan, since volumes of incoming freight and hence traffic levels	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant welcomes the Joint Response received from the host local authorities and following the statutory consultation has continued to engage with them to refine its environmental impact assessment activity, the results of which are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant considers that it has provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback to the consultation. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included a comprehensive scheme description, was necessarily preliminary in nature, reflecting the fact that consultation was undertaken at a time to enable feedback to influence the scheme the subject of the application. As is established practice, the Applicant assessed the Scheme's impact according to Rochdale Envelope method of assessing the maximum parameters, meaning that a worst-case scenario for the impacts of the Scheme has been assessed in the PEI Report and the Environmental Statement. It is established practice that detailed design only be finalised prior to commencement of construction. Finalisation of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	cannot be properly estimated.			detailed design will be secured by a requirement in the DCO, which will require approval by the relevant planning authority of the detailed design in accordance with documents submitted as part of the DCO Application. The Framework CEMP included in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has been updated following the statutory consultation and submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant, its constituent companies and consultants have an established track record of delivering projects of this kind.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We also have significant concerns about promises made during the consultation, given that it was accepted during the webinars that if the DCO was granted the directors of Sunnica would change as further companies or investment funds became involved as investors in the proposed scheme. This means that we are aware that only commitments included in a DCO can be relied upon.	Freckenham Parish Council, Snailwell Parish Council	No	The operator of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will be required to adhere to the conditions set out within any Development Consent Order (DCO). The Applicant has provided a Draft DCO with its application [EN010106/APP/3.1], and all commitments in relation to the Scheme are secured via the provisions of the DCO, in particular the requirements in Schedule 2. The provisions and requirements of the DCO will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. There is therefore no question of avoiding responsibility for commitments in the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	How can a company whose last set of published accounts identified a negative balance of £181k and whose leaders have no significant track record of managing such a massive project or of raising the necessary funding, be deemed competent of managing such a nationally significant infrastructure project?	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant and its constituent companies and consultants have an established tracked record of delivering projects of this kind. The Applicant's means of funding the project are set out in the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	There can be little doubt that Sunnica have little genuine interest in renewable energy but are simply speculators who will sell on the operating responsibility for the site to another company early in its operating life, thus reducing any control, responsibilities or accountability.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The project operator will be required to adhere to the conditions set out within any Development Consent Order (DCO) granted. The Applicant has provided a Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] as part of its DCO application. The provisions and requirements of the DCO will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. There is therefore no question of avoiding responsibility and accountability in the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Scheme will almost certainly result in a fall in property values, with no identified compensation scheme.	Isleham Parish Council	No	It is not the Applicant's experience that solar development impacts negatively upon the value of properties. The Applicant is not proposing to offer compensation for any change in property values.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	A public survey undertaken by this Parish Council indicated that 84% of all respondents do not support this application.	Isleham Parish Council	No	The Applicant accepts that not everyone is supportive of the Application. The Applicant is bringing forward the Application to answer a need for new sources of energy generation and has provided further details for this in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	NGET has been in discussions with the promoter about the proposed substation connection and works required to facilitate the Scheme. NGET wishes to have further discussions with the promoter as soon as possible, ahead of the DCO submission, about the following: •the extent of the red line boundary around the NGET Burwell substation; •the anticipated location of the new Sunnica scheme substation; and •the proposed cable routes from that substation into the NGET Burwell substation.	National Grid/National Grid Gas	Yes	The Applicant is continuing to have discussions with NGET on a regular basis. The discussions include all three points set out: a) the extent of the order boundary around the NGET Burwell substation; b) details of the Burwell National Grid substation extension proposed for the Sunnica Scheme; and c) the proposed siting of cables from the Sunnica into the NGET Burwell substation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We would also advise you to consider the conditions that should be secured for appropriate agricultural land management and/or biodiversity enhancement during the lifetime of the development, and to require the site to be decommissioned and restored to its former condition when planning permission expires.	Natural England	No	The Scheme operator will be required to adhere to the conditions set out within any DCO. This will include compliance with an agreed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) that will be developed pursuant to the Outline LEMP submitted with the DCO application, which prescribes biodiversity management measures during operation of the Scheme. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will be prepared which will set out the mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. A Framework DEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of the DCO Application. It is proposed that ecological enhancement areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of this land and it may be returned to agricultural use. Sunnica Ltd will be required to abide by the DCO consent (which will secure the DEMP) and legislation relevant at the time. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	A petition expressing opposition to the Scheme.	Red Lodge Parish Council	No	The Applicant notes the petition submitted by Red Lodge Parish Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Parish Council strongly objects to the Scheme. This position has been confirmed by a village survey which took place during November 2020. 97% of respondents indicated they were against the proposed scheme as described in the current Statutory Consultation.	Snailwell Parish Council	No	The Applicant accepts that not everyone is supportive of the Application. The Applicant has prepared its proposals having had regard to feedback received across both statutory and non-statutory consultations. This has meant that the Applicant's proposals have been shaped by feedback that it has received. Further information on the consultation undertaken and how feedback has been taken into account can be found in the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Application to answer a need for new sources of energy generation and has provided further details for this in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Parish Council objects to the Scheme. A household survey of Worlington residents, held during October 2020 showed that 89% of respondents were against the proposed scheme as described in the current Statutory Consultation. We had responses from 89 residents of Worlington, with 80 against the proposal in its current proposed size, and 57 in favour of a smaller proposal. In comparison, out of the 89 respondents, 83 were overall in favour of renewable energy, so it is quite clear that our village is not against renewable energy, but are concerned about the size of the proposed Energy Farm.	Worlington Parish Council	No	The Applicant notes the survey undertaken by Worlington Parish Council. The need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size. The Scheme design has evolved to avoid concentration in any one area. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3] and the Parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2) included within the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	A village survey has shown that 92% of residents do not agree with this scheme	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant accepts that not everyone is supportive of the Application. The Applicant is bringing forward the Application to answer a need for new sources of energy generation and has provided further details for this in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Residential amenity: It will certainly have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of Kennett, Chippenham, Snailwell, Fordham and Burwell. It will have a particularly damaging effect on the residential and visual amenity of the planned 500 home site at Kennett which the West Site A will border. It is our view that this will severely depress prices both for the affected homeowners and for the developer.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has not found this to be the case based on experience. The Applicant is not proposing to offer compensation for any change in property values. The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential dwellings. For example, at Snailwell the Scheme is well screened from view by existing vegetation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents the landscape and visual impact assessment. Although mitigation through carefully designed placements of planting has been included in the design, the assessment does conclude that there are significant adverse landscape and visual effects for a number of receptors in and around the Order limits and the surrounding villages. However, no significant adverse landscape and visual effects are predicted to residential receptors at year 15 of operations

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				because of the embedded mitigation within the Scheme design. Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] includes the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP). Figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] are the parameter plans for the Scheme, which show the layout of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Safeguarding areas for nearby airfields: We consider that the Defence Infrastructure Organisation should be consulted to ensure there will be no visual or other risks to aircrew when landing and taking off from RAF Mildenhall and RAF Lakenheath.	Fordham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the Scheme's potential impact on glint and glare. The assessment is provided in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The assessment concluded that the Scheme will have no impact on RAF Mildenhall as no solar reflections are predicted for any of the scoped and assessed aviation receptors. No detailed modelling was recommended for RAF Lakenheath as no significant effects are expected given the considerable distance of the airfield from the Scheme. The Applicant has also assessed the potential of the Scheme to attract flocking birds to the area such that it might raise the risk of bird strike. The Scheme will not create habitat that will attract significant numbers of flocking birds to the extent that they would pose a risk to aviation, and the Scheme is not located in close proximity to any large water bodies which may attract large groups of flocking birds. Further details can be found in Chapter

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We ask that Sunnica take full account of our comments and withdraw their application.	Chippenham Parish Council	No	The Applicant has had regard to the comments of Chippenham Parish Council within this appendix and Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity and therefore will proceed with its application. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The proposals are exceptionally light on any detail regarding Community Benefits.	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant is committed to providing a legacy of community benefits through the Scheme, which could include educational programmes. The Applicant has identified a number of opportunities for legacy benefits in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Suffolk County Council due to their county farms landholding in the area have created a new link along Elms Road W-257010/0 which has improved the network. The adjacent path, W-257/003/0, requires extensive screening otherwise the view could become a sea of solar panels. We believe the link along footpath W-257/010/0 that links Freckenham and Red Lodge should be extended as part of this scheme to join the U6006. This would achieve a much-improved route, the route should be alongside the existing Elms Road but ideally having a hedge to separate the road from the route, preferably it will be 4 meters wide with 2 meters of grass and 2 meters made up surface. The route could become an important improvement to the network for cyclists, walkers and equestrians. The potential is	Suffolk Local Access Forum	No	The Applicant has assessed the landscape and visual impact for recreational users of PRow W257/003/0 (VP20) within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is proposing planting around the edges of parcels of land to the south of Elms Road at parcel E22 (shown on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) to screen the PV modules from recreational users of PRow W257/003/0. The Applicant is not proposing to extend footpath W-257/010/0 but following feedback received through the statutory consultation has revised its proposals for permissive routes and is proposing a new permissive route to the south of the Site on Elms Road (see Figure 12-6 for the indicative location, with the final location subject to landowner agreement). This will intersect the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway (U6006). This route will connect U6006 with PRow W-257/003/0 which runs to Red Lodge. It will provide a safe route for the use of local residents in the area during the operational phase of the Scheme. Further details of the Applicant's proposed

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	to link the A11 underpass into Red Lodge which accommodates bridleway users.			permissive routes are provided in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and land use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	If there is any funding to be made available through, for example, S106, another key 'missing link' in terms of safe walking is an off-road path along the A142 between the footpath alongside the former Beeches hospital at grid ref 633666 and where the cycleway starts at 633663. I realise there is still the danger of crossing this extremely busy road, but having to walk on the actual carriageway is frightening! We are aware that this is in Suffolk, but the path is a key link in a circular walk from Fordham south to Lanwades, through Snailwell to Chippenham Fen and back to Fordham.	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	No	Sunnica is not proposing to establish any footpaths outside of the Order limits as part of the project.

Appendix J-2: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(b) of PA 2008

Table J-2.1 below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(b) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Section 6.2 of the **Consultation Report [EN010106/5.1]**.

Table J-2.1: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(b) of PA 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The developer should assess the significant loss of agricultural land over the lifetime of the Scheme and how this loss might be further pressurised by the need for the Council to deliver dwellings, employment and the need to provide greater areas of biodiversity.	East Cambridgeshire District Council	No	The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'Best and Most Versatile' land. Agricultural land is not lost to the temporary development and agricultural production will be maintained throughout as the site will be grazed by sheep. The fallow period created by the Scheme being in situ will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation, which will be returned to the landowner at the end of the Scheme life. We acknowledge that the Council has its own Local Plan which will be subject to its own ALC considerations as part of the development process. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility for the Scheme has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is aiming to achieve a biodiversity net gain through the delivery of the Scheme and has set out proposals on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				how it proposes to achieve this in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. The Scheme would deliver a significant benefit in terms of low carbon energy generation that would help the local authorities in meeting their own obligations to provide new methods of renewable energy generation.
Land use	Because permissive paths either cross or are bordered by the proposed DCO area, it is recommended that the works promoter seeks clarification from the Cambridgeshire Asset Information service as to the lateral width of PROW and highways in the affected area. This will help to ensure that any works proposed or undertaken within the DCO area do not encroach upon the PROW or have a negative impact on the users of the network.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant welcomes this advice from the local authorities and has engaged with the Cambridgeshire Asset Information Service to assist with the development of the Scheme and to minimise the impact on public rights of way (PROW). All temporary PROW closures will be avoided as far as possible including along the cable route; however, as a worst case scenario it is assumed that each PROW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction and decommissioning phases. The potential

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				effect on PRow closures range from Moderate adverse to a Negligible adverse effect. The temporary closures will be planned and programmed to minimise disruption to users. Further details can be found in chapters 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	The closure of all Rights of Way within the red line boundary for the duration of the construction phase seems excessive and needs to be reconsidered. There is concern that Worlington and Freckenham will effectively be cut off from recreational routes in the area during the construction phase. A phased approach should be adopted, and routes should only be closed for a minimum period, when works require it. Alternative routes should be provided. There are areas of the network that should remain open at all times due to routes being around	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant shares the view of the local authorities that the routes should only be closed for a minimum period and is proposing to employ this approach. The Applicant is not proposing to close all public rights of way (PRow) for the duration of the construction period, and the ES has assessed that there will be for a maximum of three weeks each during construction. The potential effect on PRow closures range from Moderate adverse to a Negligible adverse effect. The temporary closures will be planned and programmed to minimise disruption to users.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the edge of the scheme area and not physically affected by works.			
Land use	The closure of routes could potentially have a negative impact on other recreational areas in the wider area, including areas designated for their ecological value. These impacts will need to be assessed in the report and in the Habitat Regulation Assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the impacts of the closure of PROWs during the construction phase of the Scheme. PROW closure will be minimised as far as possible and the ES has assessed that there will be for a maximum of three weeks each during construction. As the PROWs will be closed for a short duration (maximum of 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed, rather alternative options are available in the local area and diversion signs indicating those routes will be provided. Further details can be found in chapters 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	Public access has not sufficiently increased. The suggestions from the Rights of Way Officer for desired additional routes were not taken further; some of the proposed additional permissive routes may interfere with ecological aims, for example in stone curlew areas.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has further considered its proposals for permissive routes having regard to the feedback received during the statutory consultation. The permissive routes proposed by the Applicant are outlined in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				potential impacts of the permissive routes have been assessed and details are included in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The Applicant has continued to engage with the local authorities following the statutory consultation and is aiming to facilitate additional public access in the area during the Scheme's operating life through the permissive paths it is bringing forward. The nature of the Applicant's land rights do not allow for the creation of PRow but rather provide for permissive path routes for the duration of the Scheme's operating life that must be agreed with the landowners. This means that it has very little scope to bring forward additional routes.
Land use	While the PEIR sets out that a key consideration in relation to site selection was the chosen connection point at Burwell, it is unclear how a search radius of 15km from this point was arrived at.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has considered land within a 15km search area from the point of connection at Burwell National Grid Substation which is considered by the Applicant to be the maximum viable distance for the area of search based on cost estimates provided by their independent connection provider/contractor. Further details of the process are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	The Applicant should explain why land closer to Burwell Substation does not form part of the scheme, to negate the need for the installation of extensive connecting cables, and that the use of four separate sites is an efficient strategy given the additional connection work that will need to be undertaken.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has considered land within a 15km search area from the point of connection at Burwell National Grid Substation. Planning policy seeks to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)) and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5). The Scheme's proposed location has been determined through the exclusion of grades 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land classification. Soil surveys (see Soils and Agricultural Baseline Report at Appendix 12B: of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP6.2]) have confirmed 96.2% of the land is poorer quality agricultural land, while land closer to Burwell Substation is of higher ALC grade. The alternative analysis identified seven potential development areas, none of these areas are large enough to provide the minimum land required to accommodate the whole Scheme,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				however, the potential development areas are in close proximity to each other to enable land parcels to be connected together to provide the land required. Details of the process are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	The PEIR fails to include details on the avoidance of areas that have an impact on residential areas.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant considered the avoidance of residential areas in assessing potential sites for the Scheme. Further information can be found in Appendix 4A of the ES: Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has considered the potential of the Scheme to impact on residential areas. Impacts considered including: noise, visual impact, air quality and transport. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has made changes to the Scheme design in response to the feedback received. These changes include measures to set the Scheme back from residential areas including:

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Removing parcel E07 from solar development to form area ECO2 (as shown on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) further sets the Scheme back from routes between Freckenham and Isleham. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and now form part of ECO3 (also shown in Figure 3-1) which sets the Scheme back from Worlington.
Land use	Isleham is in the early stages of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, with its area being designated on the 21 February 2019 that includes some of the Scheme site.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has considered the latest local planning policy context for the Scheme including adopted Neighbourhood Plans. This is discussed in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. As Isleham's Neighbourhood Plan is not yet made and no emerging version is available, it is not considered at this stage.
Land use	The PEIR does not appear to contain any reference to the Bay Farm Anaerobic Digester plant (ADP) and whether the scheme is likely to have any effect on the operation of the plant in terms of the production of feed to serve the plant and the associated traffic movements. It is	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	The Applicant has considered the operation of the Bay Farm Anaerobic Digester as part of the planning context of the Scheme set out in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. Approval of a non-material amendment NMA(A)/15/2109) to the original planning permission in 2019 explains

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	anticipated that the loss of land areas E24 – E32 will have a direct effect on the ADP operations, which in turn will affect the surrounding villages through the resulting increase in traffic arising from the importation of feed to the ADP from further afield.	Cambridgeshire County Council		that that the operators of the ADP plant are no longer using sugar beet and maize from the approved feedstock area which Sunnica East Site B; Sunnica West Site A; and Sunnica West Site B fall within. The non-material amendment allows an amendment to the traffic management plan to source feedstock from elsewhere allowing deliveries of other biomass products to be made via the A11. Notwithstanding this the agricultural landowner supplying sugar beet and maize has confirmed that the supply could still be met with the remaining land within the catchment area. It is considered that proposed Scheme does not have an effect on the Anaerobic Digester Plant or its traffic movements.
Land use	An assessment of the impact of the scheme on the gas conversion plant located on land parcel E30 and the high-pressure pipeline crossing this area towards Golf Links Road is required. Site allocation policies in the former Forest Heath area Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) 2019, including allocations of employment land, should be given considerable weight in the EIA process and referred to in the report as appropriate.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the interaction of the Scheme with other infrastructure and local plan allocations and has engaged with the statutory undertakers as part of its consultation activity. The Applicant has entered into agreements regarding protective provisions with statutory undertakers. Further information can be found in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Regarding employment allocations, these are considered as part of the assessment of socio economic and land use impacts of the Scheme presented in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and are also discussed in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. Local plan allocations have been considered in the cumulative assessment, which has been undertaken for each of the technical topics in Chapter 6 to 16 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	We are concerned that the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys seem to understate the land quality of these areas, as indicated for example by Natural England's Regional Agricultural Land Classification maps. Though these are strategic-scale maps, they indicate that there may be areas of grade 2 land located within the scheme. The promoter should publish the surveys relied on in the PEIR to allow them to be scrutinised.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment of agricultural land classification (ALC) within the Order Limits in line with Natural England TIN049. The findings of this assessment and details of how the assessment has been undertaken can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	Insufficient consideration has been given as to whether Sunnica East would prejudice the council's long-term cross boundary aspirations for employment growth along the A11 corridor through the review of its Local Plan (West Suffolk Issues and Options Local Plan published for consultation 13 October 2020).	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council	No	The Scheme is temporary, and decommissioning will be required at the end of its operating life. Furthermore, post construction, the operational impacts of Sunnica will be minimal. The Scheme is not expected to impede the delivery of future growth. The Applicant acknowledges the aspirations

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				of West Suffolk Council to deliver a number of infrastructure improvements in the area, to facilitate employment growth. The Environmental Statement has considered the cumulative effects of the Scheme with other developments approved and emerging in accordance with PINS Advice Note 17 Cumulative Effects Assessment. The planning history and weight given to the emerging planning policy context is also considered in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].
Land use	While the survey indicates that the promoter has met the requirement to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land, the PEIR does not acknowledge that the site is mostly productive agricultural land used for the production of crops such as potatoes, sugar beet, onions, carrots and maize. The importance of local food production should not be underestimated, and it is considered that the assessment of the proposal on agricultural land should not be limited to its classification. The Agriculture Bill 2019-21 contains a requirement for Ministers to consider the need to encourage the production of food in England, in an environmentally sustainable way. A further	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of local food production and that much of the land within the Order limits is currently used for agricultural production. The sites fall within areas of Grade 3a, 3b and 4 land, and much of the land is currently irrigated. The temporary suspension of agriculture and water extraction for irrigation during operation of the Scheme will improve the soil and make more water available for irrigation elsewhere. The impact of the temporary restriction of this agricultural production has been assessed within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It will be a requirement of the Scheme's

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	measure requires a report on food security at least once every five years.			planning consent that it is decommissioned at the end of its operating life. The Applicant recognises that it is ultimately the responsibility of the planning system to assess the balance of the temporary use of this agricultural land resource, and renewable energy generation.
Land use	West Suffolk Council would question the conclusion that as the sites are currently in agricultural use the scheme will not result in any employment loss (albeit that the PEIR then concedes that an estimated two temporary jobs will be lost). The evidence obtained by the promoter to support this assessment should be clearly set out in the ES.	West Suffolk Council	No	The existing Order limits is agricultural land, and there is expected to be no employment loss as a result of the Scheme; however, there may be some temporary farming jobs which will no longer be offered. This has been estimated to be close to two full time equivalent (FTE) jobs related to agricultural activities based on information provided by the landowners to the promoter. Considering these are not permanent jobs which are being lost, the 'deadweight' employment has been assessed as one permanent job will be lost. 'Deadweight' refers to outcomes which would have occurred without intervention such as if the Scheme were to result in a disruption to any existing economic activity currently occurring in relation to the Order limits.
Land use	West Suffolk Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council have	West Suffolk Council, East	No	The Applicant has considered the potential impact of the proposed Scheme on the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	concerns that the size of the Scheme and the subsequent loss of agricultural land may also impact the ability of the Councils to deliver future housing and employment growth, while maintaining a suitable level of agricultural land.	Cambridgeshire District Council		councils' aspirations to deliver future housing and employment growth in Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use within the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility for the Scheme on the developable land has been undertaken by the Applicant and has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant understands that the Council will undertake its own assessments in bringing forward its Local Plan for development outside of the Scheme area.
Land use	The Applicant may wish to consider the effects of dust on the panels from Worlington Quarry.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing that the PV modules will be subject to regular maintenance and checks. This will ensure that possible impacts to the Scheme's operations from the surrounding environs are addressed. Further information can be found in the Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Land use	It should be demonstrated that the promoter has engaged with the Cambridgeshire and	West Suffolk Council, East	No	The Applicant has engaged with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Peterborough Combined Authority in respect of the Cambridge Autonomous Metro.	Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		Combined Authority on its proposals for the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM). Discussions held in April and May 2021 indicate that the CAM extension to Mildenhall is at a very early stage and no route options have been determined yet and therefore cannot be considered as part of the cumulative assessment presented in the Environmental Statement.
Land use	West Suffolk Council has clear aspirations for infrastructure improvements to support existing communities and future growth. The following are of particular importance: A11 Fiveways – Highways England have previously expressed concerns regarding the at grade junctions on the A11 south of Fiveways. Longer term improvements for Fiveways Roundabout (for example at grade separation) and the at grade junctions will be considered for Highways England's RIS3 funding cycle, however there is no guarantee of funding at this stage. Improved transport links to the West of Mildenhall. Junction 38 - where the A14 meets the A11. Ipswich to Cambridge railway line – ability to deliver increased passenger or freight services. The promoter should consider whether the	West Suffolk Council	No	The Scheme is temporary, and decommissioning will be required at the end of its operating life. The Scheme is not expected to impede the delivery of infrastructure improvements to support existing communities and future growth, particularly given its minimal effects in the operation stage. The Applicant acknowledges the aspirations of West Suffolk Council to deliver a number of infrastructure improvements in the area. The Environmental Statement has considered the cumulative effects of the Scheme with other developments approved and emerging in accordance with PINS Advice Note 17 Cumulative Effects Assessment. The planning history and weight given to the emerging planning policy context

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	project would compromise future growth opportunities and improvements to these key infrastructure			is also considered in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].
Land use	Insufficient or no evidence is provided or has not been addressed adequately in the PEIR on the impact on some of the areas set out in EN1 – 5.12.3: the creation of jobs and training opportunities; the provision of additional local services and improvements to local infrastructure, including the provision of educational and visitor facilities; effects on tourism; cumulative effects – if development consent were to be granted to for a number of projects within a region and these were developed in a similar timeframe, there could be some short-term negative effects, for example a potential shortage of construction workers to meet the needs of other industries and major projects within the region.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The creation of jobs has been assessed within the operational employment section of the Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further information regarding the provision of training opportunities is provided within the outlined in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8]. The provision of additional local services including the provision of educational and/or visitor facilities was not included within the proposed scope of the Socio-economics and Land Use assessment. The Scoping Opinion received did not request such an assessment be added. The Scheme does not include the provision of educational and/or visitor facilities; however, it is possible that training and educational activities will form part of the Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Strategy which will be developed for the Scheme in due course. Please refer to the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan submitted as part of the DCO application. Tourism was scoped out of the assessment as no tourism receptors were identified and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				responses to the scoping opinion received from PINS and statutory consultees did not require such an assessment. Section 12.11 "Cumulative Effects" of Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the potential effects of the Scheme in combination with the potential effects of other development schemes within the surrounding area for each impact in each respective phase (construction, operation and decommissioning). This includes construction employment, operation employment, PRowS and impacts to residential properties, business premises and community facilities in the surrounding area.
Land use	East Cambridgeshire District Council note that the Grid Connection Corridor goes very close to site allocations FRD6 and FRD7 (see adopted Local Plan 2015) in Fordham and the developer will need to show that its proposal will not damage the ability of these existing business to operate/expand nor would it affect any planning conditions that these landowners are required to comply with. The developer will also need to demonstrate that the proposal does not result in any detrimental impact to the horse	East Cambridgeshire District Council	No	The Applicant has considered the planning context of the Scheme and the relationship between the Scheme and allocations within the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan. These are considered as part of the assessment of socio economic and land use impacts of the Scheme presented in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also discussed in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	racing industry in the local area (as required by Policy EMP6 within the adopted Local Plan 2015).			The Site Allocations FRD6 and FRD7 have also been considered as part of the cumulatives assessment in the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Scheme, see Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], to determine whether cumulative effects are likely. Appendix 16A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents an assessment of the effects of glint and glare arising from the Scheme which is summarised in Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This concludes that horse racing facilities in the vicinity of the Order limits will not experience any significant adverse effects due to visibility of any modules being screened from view by existing vegetation and landform as well as the proposed mitigation planting. Prior to the planting being established the assessment concludes that these facilities would experience a low impact in terms of glint and glare due to the location of the solar reflection and reflections coinciding with direct sunlight. Engagement with Godolphin Management Group has led to the Applicant proposing

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				temporary measures to minimise disturbance to horse racing uses abutting the boundary of Sunnica West Site A. Measures embedded into the design include not undertaking construction works within fields adjacent to 'The Gallops' on Sunnica West Site A prior to 10:00am to limit disruption to their horse training activities. Temporary fencing is also proposed to be installed locally along the boundary of Sunnica West Site A to screen views until the establishment of the proposed planting.
Land use	It is noted that there are proposals for other solar PV installations in the vicinity of Burwell substation and it is assumed that all such installations will want to use the same connection point. The Applicant should demonstrate that their proposal is still feasible and viable should these other installations be completed ahead of the anticipated operation years.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Grid Connection Statement [EN010106/APP/7.4] discusses the connection agreement in place at Burwell National Grid Substation.
Land use	Greater clarification on the amount of different grades of agricultural land is required in order for the developer to justify that states the Scheme: "maximises the	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County	No	The Alternative Site Assessment presented in Appendix 4A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] assessed the alternative options for the Scheme, which included the use of low grade, non-best and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	utilisation of low grade, non-best and most versatile agricultural land"	Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		most versatile land agricultural land as part of the site selection criteria. The Applicant has undertaken its own detailed assessment of agricultural land classification within the Order Limits and concluded that the Sites consist of Grade 3a, 3b and 4 land. The findings of this assessment and details of how the assessment has been undertaken can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	No consideration has been given as to how the construction and operational phases could cause recreational impacts on designated sites through potential changes to: public access; avoidance of local area during construction; loss of access and newly created public access.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has given consideration to the impacts of the Scheme on public rights of way and local transportation routes during construction, operation and decommissioning, and effects have been assessed to be insignificant. Further assessment has also been carried out as to the Scheme's Landscape and Visual Impact. Further details can be found in chapters 10, 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	We would like to request that the next stage of assessment also considers the loss of such a large extent of countryside landscape in relation to the impact this may have on allowing conservation minded-farmers and	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	Yes	The Applicant appreciates the comment with regards to 'conservation minded farmers and charities'; however, at the time of Application the Applicant is not aware of any such initiatives or the intension to bring any forward. However, the Applicant is aiming to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	charities to deliver habitats for wildlife at a landscape scale.	Cambridgeshire County Council		achieve a biodiversity net gain through the delivery of the Scheme and has set out proposals on how it proposes to achieve this in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In addition, the landscape design includes substantial areas of new grassland, hedgerow and tree planting which are considered to be able to deliver landscape scale habitats for wildlife to a greater extent than the existing arable farmland. The benefits to ecology are set out in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (ES) and the assessment in relation to the change to landscape character is set out in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The councils' position is that PRow should only be closed when absolutely necessary for safety reasons. Commonly on similar sites (EA1) rights of way have remained open except for when construction work is	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County	No	As it was not possible to confirm at PEI Report stage with certainty the length of time each PRow would be closed for, as a worst-case scenario, it was assumed that the PRow lying within the Order limits would be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	being undertaken across the route. Where closure is unavoidable suitable temporary diversions should be agreed with the relevant authority.	Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		closed for the entire length of the construction period. This information is now known and assessed within Chapter 12: Socio-economics and land use of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1]. All temporary PRow closures will be avoided as far as possible including along the cable route; however, as a worst case scenario it is assumed that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. As the PRows will be closed for a short duration (maximum of 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.
Land use	The councils note a reference in Fig 4.3 of the PEIR of potential permissive routes. As such routes can be removed at any time should not be considered to constitute mitigation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing permissive routes to provide for mitigation for the loss of access to some areas during the Scheme's operating life. These routes will be provided for the duration of the time for which there is an adverse impact to mitigate. The nature of the Applicant's land ownership precludes providing PRow as the Scheme is ultimately temporary. Further details are provided in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The list of PROW closures during construction, (Pp24 of the Transport Assessment) includes footpath 204/1, assumed for the purpose of being crossed by secondary access F to West Site B W02, (as shown in the Transport Assessment, Fig 5-1, Pp28). Clarity is needed as to the exact alignment, to confirm if this impacts footpath 49/1. Provisions should be made either to enable safe crossing of either footpath throughout the works or if this is not possible, for the construction work to be scheduled to close this route for the shortest possible period. Secondary Access F to Sunnica West site B (as shown in the Transport Assessment, Fig 5-1, Pp28) is referred to elsewhere as G, and shown in various figures as not extending to connect to Chippenham Road.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The access locations have been revised for the ES. These are shown on Figures 3-13 and 13-5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The access point G referred to in the comment has been removed, and Sunnica West Site B will be accessed from Snailwell Road via access point D (secondary access point). Footpath 204/1 will still be affected during construction of Grid Connection Route B, so this will need to be closed for the short period that it is directly affected during construction. As a worst case scenario, it is assumed that this will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase.
Land use	Clarification should be provided as to what land is required on a permanent basis and what is required on a temporary basis.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has provided details of whether land will be required on a temporary or permanent basis in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and illustrated on the Land Plans [EN010106/APP/2.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The PEIR fails to include two critical requirements in connection with site selection in connection with the avoidance of areas that have an impact on residential areas and, in respect of Sunnica East, the avoidance of an impact on The Brecks	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of residential areas and The Brecks Special Protection Area in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites. Details of the process are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Human Health	It should be noted that the traffic flows for a monitoring survey starting in September 2020 may not reflect the long-term traffic flows and therefore levels of air pollution in the area and this should be considered during any subsequent assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	September 2020 would not reflect the long-term traffic flows (and therefore levels of air pollution) in the area, given that it falls with the peak year of the impact of the coronavirus pandemic. The traffic flows identified in Chapter 12 Transport and Access [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Transport Assessment included as Appendix 13B of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] are based on traffic surveys carried out pre-pandemic. Baseline traffic flows were obtained for the strategic road network from WebTRIS fixed traffic counters maintained by Highways England. Data was obtained for September 2019 as it is a neutral month pre-covid-19 pandemic. In addition, it is considered 2020 traffic flow

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				data would be unreliable due to the impact of the covid-19 pandemic and the resultant national and local lockdowns.
Human Health	At this stage no assessment of the impact on local air quality from construction traffic has been carried out, however, it is acknowledged that an impact is possible, and an appropriate assessment based on site specific information is proposed. We accept this methodology, but we would recommend caution with the use of baseline data collected during 2020 and early engagement on the selection of sensitive receptor locations.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	An assessment of the impact on air quality from construction traffic has been undertaken in Chapter 14 (Air Quality) the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Due to the COVID pandemic, traffic counts were not able to be undertaken, and the traffic data was prepared based on historical data. Details can be found in Chapter 13 (Transport and Access) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The above approach was confirmed through consultation with the local authorities. Representative Sensitive Receptors were identified through professional judgement by a specialist air quality consultant.
Human Health	The councils are concerned that the risks associated with battery storage fires have not been fully explored and it is imperative that an outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan is submitted with the DCO application.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has submitted an Outline Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This strategy has been developed through consultation with the local fire authorities. A requirement to Schedule 2 of the DCO will require the approval and implementation of the final Fire Safety Management Plan, prior to commencement of the Scheme, at which

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				time the plan will have been further developed so that it reflects the final Scheme design. The final plan is to be approved by the relevant planning authorities who must consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service.
Human Health	The Applicant should produce a risk reduction strategy as the responsible person for the scheme as stated in the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. It is expected that safety measures and risk mitigation is developed in collaboration with services across both counties. The strategy should cover the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the project.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has submitted an Outline Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This strategy has been developed through consultation with the local fire authorities. A requirement to Schedule 2 of the DCO will require the approval and implementation of the final Fire Safety Management Plan, prior to commencement of the Scheme, at which time the plan will have been further developed so that it reflects the final Scheme design. The final plan is to be approved by the relevant planning authorities who must consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service. The plan is required to include measures to facilitate safety during the construction, operation and decommissioning.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	During the construction phase the number of daily vehicle movements in the local area will significantly increase. The emergency services will want to view the Transport Strategy to minimise this impact and prevent an increase in the number of road traffic incidents. Any development should not negatively impact on the services' ability to respond to an incident in the local area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant consulted with the emergency services during the statutory consultation and has further engaged with the local authorities and fire services following the consultation. The Applicant has provided a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan as part of its DCO application (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]), which incorporates the outcome of consultation.
Human Health	The promoter should undertake an Equality Impact Assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	During further consultation with Suffolk County Council it was agreed that a Equality Impact Assessment was not required for the Scheme.
Human Health	The Applicant should minimise fire risks with the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) by procuring components and using construction techniques which comply with all relevant legislation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application to reduce the risk of fire. This document has been developed through consultation with the local fire authorities. A requirement to Schedule 2 of the DCO will require the approval and implementation of the final Battery Fire Safety Management Plan, prior to commencement of the Scheme,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				at which time the plan will have been further developed so that it reflects the final Scheme design. The Applicant is proposing a number of embedded design measures with and associated with the battery energy storage system (BESS) as part of the Scheme, which would minimise fire risk and comply with all relevant legislation. Embedded mitigation measures in the design to reduce the risk of fire are provided within Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and include internal automated sprinkler or water mist system, firefighting water for the Fire and Rescue team, isolation of electrical sources to enable firefighting activities, measures to extinguish or cool batteries involved in fire, containment of fire water run-off; handling and responsibility for disposal of damaged batteries and establishment of regular onsite training exercises. The Applicant will procure the BESS components through its internal procurement process which ensures that all suppliers abide by relevant legislation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				It is anticipated that the BESS will be brought to site in modular form and placed on site in the required location, all construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with are relevant legislation.
Human Health	The Applicant should ensure that the BESS is located away from residential areas. Prevailing wind directions should be factored into the location of the BESS to minimise the impact of a fire involving lithium-ion batteries due to the toxic fumes produced.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing that the BESS is located away from areas with residential dwellings. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application to reduce the risk of any fire. This document has been developed through consultation with the relevant statutory authorities. This document sets out a number of design considerations including the measures to reduce the impact of fumes in the event of a fire. The Applicant has also conducted an air quality study to investigate the potential impact of fumes produced by the BESS. Details of this can be found in Appendix 16D Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the Environmental Statement. The assessment has determined that even in the unlikely

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers, the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.
Human Health	The Applicant should develop an emergency response plan with both counties fire services to minimise the impact of an incident during construction, operation and decommissioning of the facility. The emergency response plan should include details of the hazards associated with lithium-ion batteries, isolation of electrical sources to enable firefighting activities, measures to extinguish or cool batteries involved in fire, management of toxic or flammable gases, minimise the environmental impact of an incident, containment of fire water run-off, handling and responsibility for disposal of damaged batteries, establishment of regular onsite training exercises. The emergency response plan should be maintained and regularly reviewed by the	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has submitted an Outline Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application. This strategy has been developed through consultation with the Suffolk and Rescue Department and has incorporated their requirements. A requirement to Schedule 2 of the DCO will require the approval and implementation of the final Fire Safety Management Plan, prior to commencement of the Scheme, at which time the plan will have been further developed so that it reflects the final Scheme design. The approval of the final plan is proposed to be by the relevant planning authorities in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service. A requirement of the Outline Fire Safety

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Applicant and any material changes notified to SFRS and CFRS.			Management Plan is the production of an emergency response plan.
Human Health	Environmental impact should include the prevention of ground contamination, water course pollution, and the release of toxic gases.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1] considers the pollution pathways and mitigation measures and concluded that there were no significant risks to water resources. The PV modules are of robust construction and would need significant mechanical load to separate the modules. Therefore, the risk of any liquid leakage, and any gaseous leakage, is considered very low especially in any large quantities. A Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment (PERA) has been prepared for the Scheme. A Conceptual Site Model (CSM) was prepared with a view to identifying any potentially significant source-pathway-receptor linkages. This was followed by an environmental risk assessment. This has demonstrated that the residual effect of the Scheme is very low to low for identified receptors. The Framework CEMP, OEMP and DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] contain measures to avoid land contamination during construction, operation and decommissioning.
Human Health	The BESS should be designed to accommodate a number of features	West Suffolk Council, East	No	The Applicant has prepared an Outline Fire Safety Management Plan

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	including: Automatic fire detection and suppression systems. Various types of suppression systems are available, but the Service's preferred system would be a water drenching system as fires involving Lithium-ion batteries have the potential for thermal runaway. Other systems, such as inert gas, would be less effective in preventing reignition. Redundancy in the design to provide multiple layers of protection. Design measures to contain and restrict the spread of fire through the use of fire-resistant materials, and adequate separation between elements of the BESS. Provide adequate thermal barriers between switch gear and batteries, Install adequate ventilation or an air conditioning system to control the temperature. Ventilation is important since batteries will continue to generate flammable gas as long as they are hot. Also, carbon monoxide will be generated until the batteries are completely cooled through to their core. Install a very early warning fire detection system, such as aspirating smoke detection. Install carbon monoxide (CO) detection within the BESS containers.	Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		[EN010106/APP/7.6] as part of its DCO application to evaluate and mitigate the risk of fire from the BESS. This document has been developed through consultation with the relevant statutory authorities. The document has set out a number of design choices that the Applicant has made to ensure the safety of the BESS including: separation distance between the containers, fire safety infrastructure such as available sources of water for firefighting and access points in case of emergency for the fire services.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Install sprinkler protection within BESS containers. The sprinkler system should be designed to adequately contain and extinguish a fire. Ensure that sufficient water is available for manual firefighting. An external fire hydrant should be located in close proximity of the BESS containers. The water supply should be able to provide a minimum of 1,900 l/min for at least 2 hours. Further hydrants should be strategically located across the development. These should be tested and regularly serviced by the operator. A safe access route for fire appliances to manoeuvre within the site (including turning circles). An alternative access point and approach route should be provided and maintained to enable appliances to approach from an up wind direction. Please note that SFRS requires a minimum carrying capacity for hardstanding for pumping/high reach appliances of 15/26 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2000 Approved Document B, 2006 Edition, due to the specification of our appliances.			
Human Health	The PEIR states that the scheme is unlikely to interfere with telecommunications and	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council,	No	The potential for effects on telecommunications and television reception is assessed in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	television reception but does not explain how this conclusion has been reached.	Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		[EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme is not expected to interfere with telecommunications because of the low-lying nature of the Scheme and the lack of potential for it to form a barrier between the mast and any receiving station. The Scheme consists of fixed low-lying infrastructure with no moving parts and is therefore unlikely to interfere with digital television signals.
Human Health	The promoter should consider the issue of electromagnetic fields in relation to human health, in consultation with Public Health England. The National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) highlights that whilst putting cables underground eliminates the electric field, they still produce magnetic fields, which are highest directly above the cable and can have both direct and indirect effects on human health.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has considered the impact of electromagnetic fields and consulted with Public Health England at the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping stage. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of our Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on the recommendation of the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Further information is available within the Scoping Opinion [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Human Health	The Applicant is required to satisfy the EqIA requirements when they submit their application to the Secretary of State. This assessment must account for people with	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council,	No	During further consultation with Suffolk County Council it was agreed that a Equality

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	protected characteristics and, in particular, must consider whether impacts of the scheme such as glint & glare or noise might affect people with physical or mental health conditions.	Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		Impact Assessment was not required for the Scheme.
Human Health	The PEIR does not seek to address the impacts of the scheme on the mental health and well-being of the affected populations. This is especially relevant in respect of the elderly and those residents that are vulnerable. In particular the construction and decommissioning phases will result in significant amounts of disruption to existing communities and this needs to be considered in relation to mental health and well-being.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Environmental Statement (ES) gives consideration to the well-being of residents in the coverage of the Human Health assessment in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Access to Healthcare Services and other Social Infrastructure is included, as is Social Cohesion and Lifetime Neighbourhoods, both key areas to well-being. Consideration is given to the potential for impacts on mental health albeit indirectly through assessing an outcome in respect of each of these determinants. The assessment has shown that there is a potential for negative impacts as a result of the Scheme; however, these are temporary.
Economy	The use of baseline data and the assumptions made in the assessment of economic effects within the PEIR are flawed to the extent that the figures produced cannot appropriately be used to assess impact.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	The Applicant has further developed the methodology and baseline data used for its assessment of economic effects and has published an updated assessment outlined in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. As agreed with the Local Authorities, a bespoke study area has

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
		Cambridgeshire County Council		been used for the ES, which includes a 45 minute travel study area (by car) out from the Order limits. This acknowledges the fact that the Scheme will lead to outputs that benefit those in Thetford, Mildenhall and Bury St Edmunds. The ES Chapter has applied a higher rate of leakage in line with HCA Additionality Guidance 'ready reckoners'.
Economy	There is also a concern about the consistency of geography use. East Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk are used for unemployment and economic activity rates. It would be preferable to be consistent in geography use to the extent possible.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The geographies in the baseline are consistent throughout Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and are used due to the size of the scheme which spans both East Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk.
Economy	The use of the Cambridge Travel to Work Area (TTWA) as the area of impact is inappropriate for a number of reasons. First, the scheme covers a great deal of land in both the Cambridge TTWA and in the Thetford and Mildenhall TTWA and may include land in the Bury St Edmunds TTWA, so using only the Cambridge TTWA will not provide complete baseline. Second, the Cambridge TTWA will be distorted by the heavy weight of Cambridge's economy, which accounts for much of the travel within	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	It is not appropriate for a scheme of this scale to adopt three Travel to Work Areas (TTWAs) (Cambridge TTWA, Thetford and Mildenhall TTWA, and Bury St Edmunds TTWA) in its analysis of economic impacts. Assuming the approximate labour market covers all three TTWAs would not likely be representative of the area workers would travel from. As such, a 45-minute travel study area was agreed with the Local Authorities. This is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the TTWA. This distortion further reduces the relevance of this baseline to a scheme on the periphery of the TTWA with very different employment characteristics. Thirdly, the use of the Cambridge TTWA implies that workers from within West Suffolk are not local for the purposes of impact evaluations. This is clearly an undesirable outcome.			deemed to be an appropriate study area to assess economic impacts (shown in Figure 12-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). Leakage rates have been applied in line with HCA Additionality Guidance to capture the proportion of outputs that benefit those outside of the interventions target area. Acknowledging the fact that the Scheme will lead to outputs that benefit those from Thetford, Mildenhall and Bury St Edmunds, the ES Chapter has applied a higher rate of leakage in line with HCA Additionality Guidance 'ready reckoners'.
Economy	For a project of this scale, it would be more appropriate to define a bespoke TTWA using census data, perhaps using the two district geographies as a starting point. The selection of TTWA is relevant because it defines the leakage percentage used in economic additionality calculations.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A bespoke study area based on a 45 minute travel time from the Order limits has been used for the ES, as agreed with the Local Authorities. A bespoke TTWA could have been used for the baseline conditions using 2011 Census data on origin and destination that underpins their TTWA analysis. However, this dataset is 10-years old and would require us to draw on comparable data for other indicators of this age for it to provide a consistent analysis. By basing in on the two local authorities where the scheme is located, this allows for the use

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				of the latest data released in 2019/20 (i.e. ONS Annual Population Survey, BRES, Mid-Year population estimates) as should be the priority in these assessments.
Economy	The multiplier used in 12.4.19 of the PEIR to calculate indirect and induced employment gains (1.5) is high for a scheme like this. For example, the Scottish Power offshore wind projects have used a multiplier of 1.31 for indirect impacts and 1.21 for induced. The use of the ready reckoner from HCA Additionality Guidance Further is reasonable, but justification of the multiplier selected is necessary. Specifically, the assessment of supply chain linkages should be expanded on since it is expected that many components will not be sourced from the local or national economy. Without justification for these assumptions, the calculations in section 12.8 are clearly unreliable and, by using an inappropriate statistical geography, are irrelevant to the real geography which will be impacted.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The multiplier effect has been reduced to that stated in the Solar Powered Growth in the UK report produced by the Centre for Economics and Business Research ('CEBR') as being a relevant economic multiplier to apply to solar power development projects in the UK (1.33). It reflects that there is potential for some components to be sourced from supply chains outside the local or national economy.
Economy	An assessment of the impact of the proposal on tourism should be undertaken. The Scheme could result in visitors being	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire	No	The scope of works for Socio-economics and Land Use as submitted in the Scoping Report to the PINS proposed no assessment of

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	deterred from seeking the solitude and long-distance views in many parts of the development. This would be to the detriment of both recreational and tourist objectives of the affected local authorities.	District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		effects on tourism with no specific receptors having been identified to justify such an assessment being needed. The Scoping Opinions responses received from PINS and all statutory consultees also did not request that such an assessment was required. On that basis, no assessment of effects on tourism has or will be undertaken. However, the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter of the PEIR (Chapter 10) does assess the impact on visitor views in the vicinity of the scheme and the loss of long distance views as relevant, including from PROWs which provide the main opportunity for recreation in this otherwise predominantly agricultural area of the countryside. Accordingly, the Socio-Economics and Land Use Chapter (Chapter 12) has assessed impacts on PROWs users which may include visitors to the area.
Economy	National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 highlights the need for equality, community cohesion and well-being to be assessed. Based on the information contained within the PEIR it is unclear whether these matters have been fully considered. In particular, the impact on the local communities affected should be explored further. There is no reference in the PEIR to legacy benefits, i.e. education and training	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Chapter 15: Human Health and Wellbeing of the PEIR (Section 15.8) covers impacts on local communities. Also see table 15-8 on the impacts relating specifically to Social Cohesion and Lifetime Neighbourhoods. Education and training opportunities have been explored in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	opportunities, or a visitor centre. In addition, there is insufficient evidence that construction and operation jobs will be filled locally or that there will be long-term benefits in the form of skills enhancements. Further assessment of future skills development is required.			[EN010106/APP/7.8] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.
Economy	To date the promoter has offered very little detail with respect to community benefits.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is committed to providing a legacy of community benefits through the Scheme, which could include educational programmes. The Applicant has identified the potential to promote science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.
Design	The proposed areas for PV panels are encroaching too close towards Isleham, and the proposals (including mitigation) do not respect the fenland edge character of this area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The modules are set back from Isleham, the nearest of which would be approximately 550m from residential areas and 450m from the Ark Church in Isleham. Modules will be set back with a grassland buffer and screened with woodland planting. The proposed planting is considered to reflect the character of trees and vegetation at Beck Bridge, adjacent to the Lee Brook and to the south of Isleham, at Isleham nature reserve,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				adjacent to the B1104, to the south of Isleham. The Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] show the limits of land within the Order limits on which it is proposed to develop PV modules, together with the land which would be used for screening and planting.
Design	The proposal is encroaching too close to the avenue leading to Chippenham Hall, affecting the setting of a registered park and garden.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design in this area and is incorporating greater setbacks with a new planting regime along the avenue at parcels W04 and W05 (shown in Figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). The Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] show the limits of land within the Order limits on which it is proposed to develop PV modules, together with the land which would be used for screening and planting.
Design	There are further landscape concerns are around the U6006 road, Worlington, West Row, La Hogue Road, the B1085 and the view from Newmarket (Limekilns), E18 and E33.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	Yes	The Applicant has revised the Scheme proposals following the statutory consultation and has made the following changes to the Scheme design as illustrated on the Parameter Plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2) in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]: The extent of modules in proximity to U6006

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
		Cambridgeshire County Council		has been reduced, with E11 and E23 removed to form part of grassland ECO3. The incorporation of ECO3 increases the set back of modules from Worlington and West Row. The extent of modules has also been reduced in relation to La Hogue Road and the B1085, via the removal of W13 and W14 (as shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). The set back of PV modules from La Hogue Road has also increased to enable more planting in combination with the overall retention of the roadside hedgerows. There has also ben additional setbacks and planting around the proposed BESS at E18 and E33. Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) has identified the view from the Limekilns. The Scheme includes new planting and suitable rendering of the BESS to aid in reducing the overall visibility of the modules, but the Scheme will be visible due to the open character of the intervening landscape and elevated position of people at the Limekilns. The changes to the Parameter Plans discussed above are reflected in the Works

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] for which the applicant seeks development consent.
Design	Despite the significant changes to the red line, Sunnica West A would be a vast expanse of uninterrupted solar plant.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has revised its Scheme proposals following the statutory consultation and has made changes to the Scheme design including removing parcels W13, W14 and W16 (shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) from the Order limits. The Applicant has also incorporated greater landscaping within Sunnica West Site A at W11, W12, and W15 (shown in Figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) in relation to the local road networks to aid in reducing the perception of the Scheme. Existing vegetation, including woodlands and The Avenue are retained across Sunnica West Site A, along with areas of new native grassland (i.e. ECO4), so that there is not a continuous extent of PV modules. Parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2) outlining the proposed changes can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The changes to the Parameter Plans discussed above are reflected in the Works

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] for which the applicant seeks development consent.
Design	All boundary changes should be reviewed as they could result in additional effects on receptors, for example at Biggin Farm (close to Grade II Listed Fordham House) and at Chippenham Fen (additional encroachment on avenue).	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has updated its EIA activity to reflect the revised Scheme boundaries. The full results are reported in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Biggin Farm is located immediately south of Grid Connection Route B and to the west of Sunnica West B. Given the offset distance from Biggin Farm from Sunnica West B, and the large ecological buffer within Sunnica West B there are no adverse effects anticipated for Biggin Farm. Similarly, although there may be temporary construction effects related to the construction of the cable corridor, no significant effects are anticipated.
Design	In order to minimise and eliminate adverse landscape impacts from the revised layout of the scheme, a creative and iterative approach to the design of the solar farm and landscape mitigation is necessary to resolve these issues.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme extensively, as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Impact Assessment, via a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The Applicant has further amended the Scheme design following the statutory consultation having regard to the feedback received and with reference to the Parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2) in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These changes are: Sunnica East Site A - the extent of proposed solar modules remains to the east of Beck Road, with modules removed from E07, so that the land to the west of Beck Road (ECO1 and ECO2) will be for ecological mitigation. This will retain the open character of the landscape between Freckenham and Isleham to the west of Beck Road. Sunnica East Site B - Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will be for ecological mitigation and additional offsets from Worlington. This area (ECO3) will also reduce the extent of modules in relation to U6006. A new permissive path has been included across Sunnica East Site B, to provide access from Red Lodge to Worlington and Golf Links Road, via U6006. The Scheme also incorporates additional landscape buffers in relation to the BESS at E18 and E33. Sunnica West Site A - the extent of proposed solar development has been reduced, with the removal of parcels W13, W14 and W16 (as shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.3]). The extent of proposed development has also been reduced in W15, with increased set backs from the local road networks as shown in Figure 3-2 of the ES. The changes to the parameter plans discussed above are reflected in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] for which the applicant seeks development consent
Design	Cambridgeshire County Council would recommend that Solar Stations are sited away from the Public Rights of Way and new permissive routes, and where this is not possible, that suitable sound insulation is used to mitigate against disturbance to equestrian users.	Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant is proposing to locate PV modules away from PRow. The proposed locations for solar stations can be found in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2]. Further information is also provided in the Section 11.8 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. Inverters, switchgear and other equipment will be located away from PRow.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	What is the expected peak electrical generation and annual energy generation for the site and what assumptions are being made in relation to the BESS?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has not provided details of the Sunnica Energy Farm's peak electrical generation and annual energy generation specifically. Rather areas where the PV modules will be located have been provided together with details of the maximum parameters and design principles of the PV modules. More information can be found on this in Chapter 3 - Scheme Description [EN010106/APP/6.1]. However, an assumption has been made as to the annual production from the site in terms of kWh in order to calculate the potential impact on the climate. Details of this calculation can be found within Chapter 6 - Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A similar approach has been taken with the BESS where an area has been designated for the location of the BESS together with details of the maximum parameters and design principles of the BESS structures. More information can be found on this in Chapter 3 - Scheme Description [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	How have the geographical location, local weather patterns, pollution levels and damage or failure of the key components	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County	No	The Applicant has assessed the Scheme's context as part of Scheme's design development. Further information can be found in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2], Design and Access

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	been considered in relation to the overall effectiveness of the scheme?	Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3] and Chapter 4 Alternative and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Renewable energy	The Councils expect to see a comparison to other energy generation technologies. It is appropriate to consider how alternative schemes using the same technology may have different acceptability depending on the scale of development. This includes considering the impact of multiple smaller sites generating the same total output as the proposed Scheme.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has provided analysis of the benefit the Scheme brings to the national endeavour of clean, secure and affordable energy in two ways. Firstly, in comparison to combinations of smaller independent solar schemes which generate the same total output as the proposed Scheme, and secondly in relation to generating capacity relative to other energy generation technologies. These are contained in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] and Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Decarbonisation is a UK legal requirement and solar generation plays and must continue to play an important role in the urgent decarbonisation of the UK energy supply. The cost of solar generation in the UK is already very competitive when compared to other forms of low-carbon energy generation. Solar must form part of a diverse generation mix with other forms of low-carbon technology. Solar has an important role to play as part of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				generation mix in smoothing out seasonal variations in generation alongside other low-carbon technologies. The Applicant's analysis in the Statement of Need has concluded that size is important in maximising the economic efficiency and carbon benefits of solar schemes. Larger solar scheme such as the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm are able to deliver power more quickly and at a lower unit cost than multiple solar schemes of a similar size totalling the same overall capacity. In doing so, larger schemes are able to deliver carbon reduction and economic benefits more quickly than alternative smaller developments. This is particularly important with regard to meeting the UK's net zero obligations in the 2020s timeframe.
Renewable energy	The Scheme's role in energy diversification locally is not adequately explained.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	While the Applicant acknowledges the importance of decentralised or community energy systems, this does not reduce the importance of large-scale centralised infrastructure which brings a range of important benefits through the pooling of demand and supply. These include an efficient transfer of power to locations all over the country as a surplus in one area may be needed to make up for a shortfall elsewhere.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is such a Scheme. The Applicant is not bringing forward the Scheme to diversify energy generation locally but to deliver an urgently needed new source of renewable energy generation in an area well-suited to this form of technology. The Applicant considers this location to be a suitable site for solar, as set out in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It is important to maximise the benefits of the Scheme by maximising the capacity of generation at a suitable solar site such as that proposed. The Scheme located in this area will create benefits both locally and nationally by contributing to national decarbonisation objectives. Further information is provided in the Applicant's Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Climate change	The Councils require additional information in relation to the carbon balances of the development as the land take required is clearly significant and relevant to the local activities to achieve net zero emissions.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	Yes	Land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. However,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
		Cambridgeshire County Council		it is assumed that the new areas of grassland will be returned to cropland following decommissioning of the Scheme. The beneficial GHG impact from land use change is therefore considered to only be temporary (approximately 40 years) and has therefore been excluded from the lifecycle GHG impact assessment. The Applicant has provided further information with regard to lifecycle GHG emissions in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Climate change	The Councils expect further details in relation to the fuel used on site and how this will be monitored and managed for efficient use. The promoter should provide a final report of the fuel consumption and carbon footprint of the scheme after completion showing what was undertaken to reduce fuel consumption and emissions generation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has prepared a Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2], which requires the contractor to produce and implement a Construction Resource Management Plan (CRMP), which will set out targets for fuel, waste and energy consumption. The Applicant has provided further information with regard to lifecycle GHG emissions in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It indicates that use of fuel during construction will amount to 1187 tCO₂e which is less than 1% of the total construction emissions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate change	The need for the generation of renewable energy should not be stated in isolation. The Committee on Climate Change (CCC) have stated that a considerable amount of carbon could be stored by improved land use and from land use change. It would be beneficial to understand how this project may impact on these expected targets and the stated ambitions for a Nature Recovery Network.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	An assessment of GHG impacts from land use change associated with the conversion of arable land to grassland has been omitted from this chapter. Land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. However, it is assumed that the new areas of grassland will be returned to cropland following decommissioning of the Scheme. The beneficial GHG impact from land use change is therefore considered to only be temporary (approximately 40 years) and has therefore been excluded from the lifecycle GHG impact assessment. This is considered to be a robust worst-case approach and likely to underestimate the beneficial effect of the scheme, as it is expected that tree planting could be retained after decommissioning.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate change	The scheme description fails to identify the electrical generation capacity for the scheme, and it is considered that this information should be contained within this section in the same way that it is detailed in the Scoping Opinion. Likewise, confirmation of the BESS electrical capacity should also be contained within this section. Such information will enable an assessment of the Green House Gas (GHG) impacts benefits from the Scheme.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant did not provide details of the Scheme's generating capacity at the PEIR stage because improvements in technology could mean that the Sunnica Energy Farm has the potential to generate additional renewable electricity during its operating life than that outlined during the Scoping Opinion stage. It would not therefore make sense for the Applicant to be tied to a generating capacity that could prove less efficient in the future. Such an approach is common across longer term renewable energy projects and the Applicant has not specified a generating capacity in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of its DCO application. The development (including of the solar generating station and BESS) will instead be controlled and limited by the DCO requirements, areas shown on the works plans, design principles (which include maximum parameters) and impacts assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An assumption has been made as to the annual production from the site in terms of kWh in order to calculate the potential impact on the climate. Details of this calculation can

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				be found within Chapter 6 - Climate Change of the Environmental Statement.
Climate change	It follows that confirmation is required that the figures stated in relation to the operational emissions benefits are correct – it is noted as being 744,061 tCO ₂ e (6.8.32) over the 40-year project life – with an average emissions factor of 0.0316 tCO ₂ e/kWh.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	For the purposes of the lifecycle GHG impact assessment presented in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], the Scheme has not been assessed on the basis of the GHG benefit, but instead by comparing the GHG intensity of the Scheme with that of the projected national grid GHG intensity, as well as that of alternative energy generation types.
Climate change	If there is an issue with the energy generation and emissions savings figures then all emissions figures should be reviewed to ensure Completeness,	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	The Applicant notes this comment and can confirm there are no issues with the energy generation and emissions saving figures.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	Accuracy, Consistency, Relevance, and Transparency.	Cambridgeshire County Council		
Climate change	In relation to "Operation stage" the information should include information in relation to soil carbon and sequestration in vegetation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	An assessment of GHG impacts from land use change associated with the conversion of arable land to grassland has been omitted from this chapter. Land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. However, it is assumed that the new areas of grassland will be returned to cropland following decommissioning of the Scheme. The beneficial GHG impact from land use change is therefore considered to only be temporary (approximately 40 years) and has therefore been excluded from the lifecycle GHG impact assessment. This is considered to be a robust worst-case approach and likely to underestimate the beneficial effect of the scheme, as it is expected that tree planting could be retained after decommissioning.
Climate change	The applicant should provide greenhouse gas emissions boundaries. The Councils would like to see a county or regional approach with reference to total greenhouse	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council,	No	Due to the global nature of climate change and GHG emissions, the Applicant does not consider it appropriate to apply local or regional GHG emissions boundaries,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	gas emissions. This includes the magnitude criteria for the greenhouse gas impact assessment.	Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		particularly as a great deal of the GHG emissions from the Scheme (for example much of the embodied carbon in construction materials) are anticipated to occur outside any local or regional boundaries.
Climate change	In relation to section 6.6 of the PEIR, Baseline Conditions, as set out in Table 6.6 in the comments from the Planning Inspectorate a more detailed response in relation to baseline conditions is required.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has provided an assessment of baseline conditions in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], which has been updated since the PEIR to provide clarity.
Climate change	What figures for carbon storage has the EIA processes used to assess the soil carbon storage and carbon sequestration from vegetation from the 1,073-hectare site?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The calculations for soil and vegetation carbon sequestration, as presented in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], were undertaken using carbon sequestration factors published by the European Commission (2010).
Climate change	What is the annual rate of carbon storage and what is the value over 40 years and then in comparison to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	A single carbon sequestration figure has been applied for each land use type, rather than modelling carbon sequestration over time, as per the carbon sequestration factors published by the European Commission (2010).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
		Cambridgeshire County Council		The Applicant has considered the impact of carbon sequestration within Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. However, the new areas of grassland will be handed back to the farmers and expected to return to cropland following decommissioning of the Scheme. The GHG impact from land use change is therefore considered to only be temporary (approximately 40 years) and has therefore been excluded from the lifecycle GHG impact assessment.
Climate change	How does the figure for the annual rate of carbon storage compare to the following statement? “While the current land use within the DCO Site will have minor levels of associated GHG emissions, it is anticipated that these emissions will not be material in the context of the overall Scheme. Therefore, for the purposes of the lifecycle GHG impact assessment, a conservative GHG emissions baseline of zero is applied.”	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Calculations undertaken by the Applicant in relation to carbon sequestration considered both the current and proposed future land uses. Therefore, the baseline carbon sequestration of the current land use has been considered. As outlined in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a temporary beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate change	We do not feel it is sufficient to rely on the emissions savings during operation instead of ensuring the emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning are properly targeted and managed. In addition, the UK Net Zero Emissions target means it is even more important that the construction, operation, and decommissioning emissions arising from the development are minimized as much as possible as the GHG benefits of the site will diminish over time.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant agrees it is important to minimise carbon emissions from the Scheme during construction, operation and decommissioning. The Applicant has provided details of the measures it proposes to take to minimise impacts during construction in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Measures to manage carbon emissions during operation and decommissioning are outlined in the Framework Operations Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2] and the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has considered the Scheme's greenhouse gas emissions during construction, operations and decommissioning in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Climate change	In relation to Table 18-1 of the PEIR, the Climate Change section of the table states "No significant residual effects on climate change are predicted during construction of the Scheme." We would like to see some information that quantified what the land use change impacts may be on soil carbon and	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential of the Scheme to impact on carbon sequestration in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Responses to ecology

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	carbon sequestration from vegetation as this could be significant locally. Similarly, the same point is made in respect of the Ecology Section and the water environment particularly soil run off during construction and its impacts on the water environment.	Cambridgeshire County Council		and water environment comments are provided in relevant sections where raised.
Climate change	The Councils feel that additional mitigation measures should be put in place to ensure that soil and vegetation carbon storage is improved and the emissions arising from the development are minimised.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the potential for the Scheme to impact on carbon sequestration in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme design includes substantial areas of tree, hedgerow and native grassland planting as part of the landscape and ecological mitigation, which will in turn provide areas of carbon storage. These mitigation measures are secured via the Landscape Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), which is secured by a requirement in the DCO, such that sufficient mitigation measures are in place to ensure soil and vegetation carbon storage.
Landscape and visual amenity	The UK Solar PV Strategy requires proposals to be appropriately sited, with proper weight given to environmental considerations such as landscape and visual impact, heritage, and local amenity. Insufficient weight has been given to the	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	The Applicant considers the Scheme to be appropriately sited, and that its design and development has given significant weight to environmental considerations, The Alternative Assessment considered a range of spatial constraints in determining the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	environmental effects of the proposal, particularly in relation to its landscape and visual impact.	Cambridgeshire County Council		appropriateness of the site, including designated international and national ecological and geological sites, Agricultural Land Classification, Urban Areas, Greenbelt and nationally designated landscapes see Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] for further information. The Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3] explains the iterative design process that has been undertaken in the scheme design, including consideration of visual impacts and aiding integration via the retention of existing site features and where necessary introducing landscape mitigation measures; to be managed pursuant to the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. The LVIA also assesses the Scheme in relation to landscape character areas and people views.
Landscape and visual amenity	The methodology for the assessment of landscape and visual effects of the scheme is fundamentally flawed and therefore leads to conclusions that the Councils cannot agree with. The methodology should be agreed prior to preparation of Environmental Statement to avoid uncommon ground in this area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The assessment methodology is not fundamentally flawed and has been based on appropriate guidance and policy requirements. The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has further developed its methodology with the host authorities prior to the preparation of the Environmental Statement. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	To better understand comparisons to projects with significant visual impact, the Councils would like to see an appraisal of Onshore Wind as a comparator project or a hybrid Onshore Wind and solar PV project. The reason for this appraisal of the alternative generation technologies is to help us to understand the benefits and challenges of the proposed approach.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	It is not considered appropriate to compare the significant visual impact of the Scheme against other projects. The local context of the individual projects will have a significant bearing on the extent of the visual impact.
Landscape and visual amenity	With regard to the assessment process, the boundaries between baseline studies and proposal assessment are not sufficiently defined. The sensitivity of the landscape to this project is not a part of the baseline but forms part of the assessment. The assessments and judgements of value and susceptibility are not adequately evidenced and explained. Perceptual, aesthetic, cultural and social aspects of landscape do not appear to be considered; the focus is on physical features, which is important, but not sufficient.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The boundaries between the baseline studies and the assessment are sufficiently defined and have been provided in a series of appendices for ease of reference. The assessments and judgements on value and susceptibility have been developed with the host authorities following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and are considered appropriate for the assessment. The identification of the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors is presented in the assessment phase, within the landscape and visual assessment tables. The perceptual, aesthetic, cultural and social aspects of the landscape are assessed as part of the landscape methodology, and are set out for the relevant landscape character receptors.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Further details can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	In Appendix 10E of the PEIR reference is made only to the National Landscape Character Areas, which is not comprehensive enough. As the grain of assessment gets finer on the local assessment level, it is important to further refine and adjust the assessments of coarser grain assessments, where available, and to analyse where the local character is congruent and where it is different from the wider landscape character.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the supporting appendices set out the relevant published landscape character assessments at national, county, borough and neighbourhood level. Chapter 10 is also supported by an assessment of local landscape character areas within Appendix 10, which have been defined by the Applicant. Appendix 10E also takes into account the published landscape character areas at all scales. The combination of the published character assessments and local landscape character areas is considered comprehensive and proportionate to the proposed Scheme.
Landscape and visual amenity	The viewpoints have not been updated to reflect changes to the DCO red line and the scheme design that has occurred. A number of viewpoints which previously were representative are now redundant as they no longer focus on the application site, while other viewpoints that would focus on the most intrusive parts of the development are missing or focused away from these	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	All viewpoints have been reviewed and re-assessed following changes to the Scheme design. The location of the viewpoints has been agreed with the host authorities with additional viewpoints also included after the consultation following discussions with the host authorities. The range of representative viewpoints are considered proportionate for the assessment of the Scheme. The baseline

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	features. The Applicant should reassess and agree the baseline methodology and the viewpoints in light of changes already made to the DCO site and scheme design and any future changes prior to preparation of Environmental Statement to avoid uncommon ground in this area.			methodology has been revised following discussions with the host authority. Further information can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], with the location of the viewpoints can be viewed in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Landscape and visual amenity	How far are the key characteristics identified in other Landscape Character Assessments present in the local area?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The relevant aspects of the key characteristics identified in other landscape character assessments have been reviewed as part of the identification of local landscape character areas defined by the Applicant and set out in Appendix 10E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. As set out in Appendix 10E, many of the key characteristics identified in landscape character assessments are present in the local area, resulting in medium to high sensitivities for landscape receptors.
Landscape and visual amenity	In terms of accessibility, the viewing angles of some of the photographs go much beyond the human field of vision, this leads to the proposed development appearing smaller within the photograph. Some important views (photomontages) are presented across two pages, with the result that the important and central elements of	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	All photographs are presented in accordance with the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals, via a Type 1 Photograph, at a near A3 size. An additional photograph is also included to demonstrate the context of the view. For the photomontages, the guidelines require the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the views, the solar installations, are effectively pushed to the edge and/or split in half. This makes it harder to read the photomontages and to understand the effects of the proposals in the landscape. The photomontages do not appear to have location maps. The remaining viewpoints have small location maps that are difficult to read, especially as all viewpoints in the area have been left in and it is near impossible to identify which viewpoint relates to the photograph. The relevant viewpoint should be highlighted on the location map for clarity. Information clarifying how/at what size the photographs should be viewed is missing.	Cambridgeshire County Council		images to be presented in a set format which has resulted in the images being presented across two pages. The Applicant has updated the photomontages in light of the revised Scheme and included additional images which depict the Scheme on one page. Location maps (Figure 10-12a - j) are provided in the Environmental Statement figures [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Landscape and visual amenity	The quarry close to Rectory farm is not perceptible in the landscape because of mature tree belts and the farm is typical of its rural location. The BESS, substation and compound at E18 is likely to have a significant visual effect and this is not picked up in the assessment and additional viewpoints are required.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes an assessment of views towards the BESS at E18 from several locations, including Elms Road (viewpoint 19) and U6006 (viewpoint 15b and 16). The location of the BESS and E18 (Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) has been informed by the extent of existing woodland in this area, to reduce the visibility of these structures.
Landscape and visual amenity	How is the local area similar or different from the wider landscape area?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire	No	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10E set out how the local area is similar or different to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
		District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		the wider landscape area. For example, the villages across the study area all have a specific character at the local scale and the fen landscapes around Burwell are different to the 'stud landscapes' around Newmarket.
Landscape and visual amenity	Golf links road, which is a quiet country lane between Worlington and Barton Mills, is used by pedestrians for recreation as well as motorists. The sensitivity of receptors should reflect this.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] identifies users of Golf Links Road as being of medium sensitivity to reflect the users. The Scheme also includes a new permissive path for pedestrians to link Golf Links Road with U6006 and existing footpaths to Red Lodge, as secured by the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
Landscape and visual amenity	The study within the PEIR does not consider whether the total effect of the individual development parcels is greater than the sum of the parts. The study should consider whether the cumulative landscape effects would change the landscape character of the area to the extent that it becomes a significantly different character type.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] does include a cumulative assessment of the landscape effects from the individual development parcels. The conclusions are that the combined effect is greater than predicted by the assessment of the individual development parcels.
Landscape and visual amenity	There is a concern that residents in some settlements, for example Worlington, would have a series of sequential views when travelling to or from their home by either car or when walking for recreation. The	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County	Yes	The Applicant has considered the impact of the Scheme on sequential views when moving between local settlements and around Worlington. The design included setbacks from the road networks, the U6006

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	geographical extent of this development suggests that a more thorough assessment of the combined effects of the development areas is required.	Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		and from Worlington. The extent of these setbacks has been increased following the consultation. With reference to the Parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2) in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3] parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will be for ecological mitigation and additional offsets from Worlington. These areas (ECO3) will also reduce the extent of modules in relation to U6006. A new permissive path has been included across Sunnica East Site B, to provide access from Red Lodge to Worlington and Golf Links Road, via U6006. The Scheme also incorporates additional landscape buffers in relation to the BESS at E18 and E33.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Landscape Character Areas fall short in describing the potential effects for each village in a meaningful way. The settings of the villages and the features which define the boundaries of the village were not identified and described. The sensitivity analysis and the further assessment of landscape and visual effects do not provide the narrative requested.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The landscape character areas do describe the potential impacts and effects for each village in a meaningful way and are set out in Appendix 10E of the Environmental Statement. The settings of the villages are covered by the local character areas, with the extent of these areas defined on Figure 10-10 within the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The sensitivity of the receptors has been reviewed and updated following discussions with the host

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				authorities and the narrative of landscape and visual effects is provided in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] with reference to supporting appendices.
Landscape and visual amenity	The effects of the elements of the project areas are assessed individually and then the interconnectivity of the project as a whole, for example where there are two site areas within a character area, or a view is of more than one component part.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	This approach has been taken in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], where the impacts of the Sites are assessed individually and then in combination.
Landscape and visual amenity	To what extent is the local character area representative of the various character areas/typologies in which it sits (define: representative – somewhat representative – less representative - not representative; should there be other categories?)?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10E has been updated following discussions with the host authority to expand upon the issue of 'representativeness'. We consider the other categories for the analysis of landscape character are suitable for the assessment of the Scheme and are based on industry guidance.
Landscape and visual amenity	For each viewpoint three photographs are included in the figures, a summer and a winter panorama and a more focused view. However there does not appear to be any explanation as to why this is the case, and it	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County	No	It is standard practice to include winter and summer photography from a viewpoint, so as to demonstrate the change as a result of the existing vegetation being in leaf. The more focused view is presented as that format

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	is not clear whether the assessment is undertaken in the context of the panorama or the more focused area.	Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		(near A3 size) is required via the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals, so as to replicate the scale of the view more accurately. The assessment is undertaken in the context of the fieldwork and the visibility perceived 'on the ground' rather than an assessment against a photograph, which illustrate existing views.
Landscape and visual amenity	The paragraphs relating to value, susceptibility and sensitivity should not form part of the baseline, as they are part of the assessment. The justifications for Landscape Value, Landscape Susceptibility and Landscape Sensitivity: are too formulaic, are based on a methodology which the Councils consider to be fundamentally flawed, need to be more descriptive and detailed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The assessment methodology is not fundamentally flawed. The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has further developed its methodology with the host authorities prior to the preparation of the Environmental Statement. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	If a project of this scale must proceed, there will be substantial residual landscape character and visual impacts that just cannot be mitigated. A creative approach to design is required avoiding monotonous rows of panels. This could be through, for example, emulating field patterns or creating shapes and vistas that promote more visual interest. The Applicant should take an exemplary	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme extensively, as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement, via a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has further amended the Scheme design following the statutory consultation having

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	approach to design and mitigation to reduce these impacts.			regard to the feedback received and with reference to the Parameter plans in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] these changes are: Sunnica East Site A - the extent of proposed PV modules remains to the east of Beck Road, with modules removed from E07 (now shown as EC02 in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3], so that the land to the west of Beck Road (ECO1 and ECO2) can be used for ecological mitigation. This will retain the open character of the landscape between Freckenham and Isleham to the west of Beck Road. ECO1 is also shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Sunnica East Site B - Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will be for ecological mitigation and additional offsets from Worlington. These areas form part of ECO3 (shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] which will also reduce the extent of modules in relation to U6006. A new permissive path has been included across Sunnica East Site B, to provide access from Red Lodge to Worlington and Golf Links Road, via U6006. The Scheme also incorporates additional landscape

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				buffers in relation to the BESS at E18 and E33. These are also shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Sunnica West Site A - the extent of proposed solar development has been reduced, with the removal of parcels W13, W14 and W16 (shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) from the Order limits. The extent of proposed development has also been reduced in W15 (shown in Figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]), with increased setbacks from the local road networks. The Applicant has not proposed a creative approach to the rows of modules as this would not be practicable for efficient maintenance protocols and land use within the Scheme.
Landscape and visual amenity	Five levels of landscape character areas and types (in total around 60 areas) are assessed separately against each individual site or cable route section and at each phase (construction, year 1, year 15, decommissioning) of the scheme. It may be more effective to assess the individual sites and cable route sections and assess which landscape character areas they would affect	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] does assess the individual sites and cable routes in relation to the landscape character areas they would affect (at construction, year 1 and year 15 phases), along with the intra-project effects at the end of each of these phases.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	and how, over time. Intra-project effects could then be assessed at the end.			
Landscape and visual amenity	The boundaries around the character areas defining the villages are far too tight. The settings of the villages and the features which define the boundaries of the villages are not adequately identified and described.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant considers that the boundary should be drawn against the village boundary as the surrounding fields are a different character area, by virtue of a different land use. This does not preclude an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on the setting of the villages, which is covered within Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The assessment is selective about the elements of the various landscape character areas/types that would be undermined by the development. In particular the significant effect on agricultural land through the change in land-use and land-cover is underplayed, and the effects dismissed because it would be reversible and/or would only occupy a small part of any one large landscape character area. A more consistent and systematic approach should be taken, based on the characteristic elements of the landscape highlighted in the assessment of baseline conditions including perceptual, aesthetic, cultural and social aspects of landscape as well as physical features.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The impact to agricultural land and land use is not underplayed, it is one of the reasons why significant adverse landscape effects are predicted. The effects are not dismissed because the Scheme is reversible; the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition, sets out in paragraph 5.5.2 that reversibility needs to be considered in the assessment process. The assessment is based on a consistent and systematic process which addresses physical change and the changes to the features of landscape value, this includes the perceptual, aesthetic, cultural and social aspects of landscape value, which are included for in the assessment methodology.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The colours representing the Local Landscape Character Areas in the PEIR appear to have been chosen mainly for ease of telling apart; for this transitional landscape it may be more useful if the colours were also to illustrate this transitional character and, if possible, use colours akin the those of the wider area assessments. This would then provide an additional visual layer of information to the text, and unusual pockets of character different from the wider areas could be more easily recognised.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has revised its presentation of the Local Landscape Character Areas in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] to reflect the colour tones used in the published studies and the degree to which these areas represent the published character. Further information can be viewed in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3]
Landscape and visual amenity	The boundaries are blurred between baseline findings and assessment. This applies to the PEIR and Appendices 10D and 10E. A clear distinction should be made between the baseline landscape character and the assessments of value, susceptibility, and sensitivity in relation to the proposals.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	We consider that the presentation and analysis of landscape and visual sensitivity (via an assessment of value and susceptibility) is suitably presented for ease of reference within Appendix 10D and 10E and within Chapter 10. The sensitivity of the receptor is similarly presented in the effects tables, again for ease of reference.
Landscape and visual amenity	Year 15 assessments should be compared to the baseline situation as well as the year 1 situation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	The year 15 assessment are made against the existing baseline, as well as making reference to the change in comparison to the year 1 situation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
		Cambridgeshire County Council		
Landscape and visual amenity	The paragraphs relating to susceptibility do not adequately analyse how the proposed development (or the elements of the development present within this area) would affect certain elements of the landscape.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation, the Applicant has further developed the methodology following discussions with the host authorities. The full results of which are presented in the Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	Consideration should also be given to whether the proposed scheme would have any impact on landscape character across the different landscape character areas/typologies, for example associated with the change of land-cover across such a diverse area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the impact of the proposed Scheme on landscape character areas across the different typologies via an assessment of the Scheme in relation to the published landscape character areas and local landscape character areas defined by the Applicant. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The assessment of visual effects does not fully explore the impact of the proposals. Whilst a general description of the elements of the development is given, the description does not go far enough in providing detail on	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	Yes	The assessment of visual effects fully explores the impact of the proposals as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] with reference to the scheme description

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	size and scale, geographical extent and duration of effects.	Cambridgeshire County Council		contained in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement.
Landscape and visual amenity	The viewpoints for Public Rights of Way and the U6006 have been set at 1.6 metres for pedestrian view. A higher equestrian view has not been provided as previously requested. This does not give a true interpretation of visual effects for all recreational users.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The photography has been taken at 1.6 metres which is considered representative. The assessment includes equestrian riders along U6006 whom are acknowledged to have a longer distance view, due to their height. The assessment of visual effects fully explores the impact of the proposals as set out in chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement for both types of user [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The Applicant should set out the methodology for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, based on existing guidance.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has set out its methodology for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This has taken account of the existing guidance published by the Landscape Institute, via the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition, 2013 (GLVIA 3) and Technical Guidance Note 02-21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations.
Landscape and visual amenity	Officers disagree that further mitigation measures are not practicable and are of the opinion that innovative design could find	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council,	Yes	The Applicant has considered the landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme extensively, as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Impact Assessment, via a

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	solutions to at least some of the effects identified.	Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The Applicant has further amended the Scheme design following the statutory consultation having regard to the feedback received and with reference to the Parameter plans in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] these changes are: Sunnica East Site A - the extent of proposed PV modules remains to the east of Beck Road, with modules removed from E07, so that the land to the west of Beck Road (ECO1 and ECO2) will be for ecological mitigation. This will retain the open character of the landscape between Freckenham and Isleham to the west of Beck Road. Sunnica East Site B - parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will be for ecological mitigation and additional offsets from Worlington. These areas now form part of ECO3 (as shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) that will also reduce the extent of modules in relation to U6006. A new permissive path has been included across Sunnica East Site B, to provide access from Red Lodge to Worlington and Golf Links Road, via U6006. The Scheme also incorporates additional landscape

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				buffers in relation to the BESS at E18 and E33 (also shown in Figure 3-1). Sunnica West Site A - the extent of proposed solar development has been reduced, with the removal of parcels W13, W14 and W16 (shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES). The extent of proposed development has also been reduced in W15, with increased setbacks from the local road networks. This is shown in Figure 3-2 of the ES.
Landscape and visual amenity	The OLEMP sets aside only 5 pages to detail the management of the DCO site which is insufficient given the complexity and size of the site. The management detail should be site specific, cover both the short and long term and must reflect the nuances of the different parts of the site.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has updated its Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan in response to the feedback received and the results of its ongoing surveys. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] is submitted with the Applicant's DCO application. The detailed measures would be developed in accordance with this outline plan and approved by the relevant local authority, pursuant to the DCO.
Landscape and visual amenity	A key component in the success of the green infrastructure will be appropriate management in the short and long term and this should be part of the vision. If the intention is for the green infrastructure to reflect the surrounding landscape character	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and	No	The success of the Green Infrastructure and that it reflects the surrounding landscape character has always been inherent to the vision. The Applicant has updated its Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan in light of the feedback received and the results of its ongoing surveys and to set out the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	and context, this should also be part of the vision.	Cambridgeshire County Council		management measures proposed. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.3] is submitted with the Applicant's DCO application.
Landscape and visual amenity	There may be a requirement for assessment of the landscape effectiveness at a future point to see if the proposed measures are effective or whether additional planting is required.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The proposed planting (along with the retention of existing vegetation overall) is considered to provide the required effectiveness. This is supported by the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to ensure the establishment of the proposed planting such that the Applicant considers the mitigation measures are effective. The PV modules are 2.5m in height and therefore considered to be able to be successfully screened by new hedge and tree planting. The BESS and substations are taller, but at heights for which new tree planting can screen views. The provision of this new planting is set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.3] and illustrated on the Parameter Plans. The outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan includes the management regimes to ensure the successful establishment of the new planting. As part of this, should any planting fail, then it would be replaced in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				next appropriate planting season. This is a standard industry approach to new planting.
Landscape and visual amenity	The information included in the visual baseline appendix goes beyond baseline description to include assessment, and the boundaries between baseline studies and assessment are blurred.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The visual baseline has not blurred the baseline and assessment. The visual baseline provides a clear description of the existing view and then a separate analysis on value and susceptibility for ease of reference. This is supported by photographs from publicly accessible locations.
Landscape and visual amenity	There is concern is that significant hedgerow removal will be required to provide visibility splays at access points, and that this will have significant habitat and visual consequences, which will need to be mitigated (for example with hedges along the returns into the site).	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with the local authorities regarding the need to provide safe access points to the sites and reviewed the design for the access points in combination with arboricultural surveys. This has included looking to utilise traffic management measures instead of undertaking vegetation removal where possible and agreeable to the local authorities. The access points are shown on the access and rights of way plans (figures 13-2 to 13-9 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] and the locations where traffic management is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				proposed is set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Where vegetation removal has been required, the impacts and effects are accounted for in the ecology and visual assessments of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The Applicant should provide references to all levels of published Landscape Character Assessments (LLCA) and set out how the LLCAs are representative of or different from the wider character areas and provide justification where LLCAs do not nest within wider character areas and boundaries are re-defined.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided details of its published Landscape Character Assessments (LLCAs) in chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10E along with a table to demonstrate the relationship to the published landscape character assessments.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Applicant should include base justifications for value, susceptibility and resulting sensitivity on sound methodology, that is agreed with the councils.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The landscape and visual assessment methodology is set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and includes justifications for value, susceptibility and resulting sensitivity. This methodology has been developed via discussions with the councils.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The descriptions of the existing views skip to the detail of the views without properly setting the scene; for example, neglecting to note if it is a rural view of open countryside. The descriptions only extend as far as they can be related to the proposals, often from the first sentence.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The descriptions of the views do not skip the detail of the view, they focus on the key features of the view and should be read in combination with the photographs presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	When valuing impacts, the special qualities of the Brecks Landscape should be considered.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the special qualities of the Brecks Landscape in the assessment of value, along with a review of the published landscape character assessment of the Brecks landscape. Further details of the Applicant's assessments can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The presentation of figures (maps) should be refined so they visually aid the interpretation of the landscape character across the study area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has updated the presentation of the landscape character figures within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] as submitted when compared to those presented in the PEIR following discussions with the host authorities.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Applicant should restructure the assessment of the landscape effects to improve the communication of findings and	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire	Yes	The Applicant has assessed more than just the physical aspects of the landscape, with consideration of perceptual, aesthetic,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	all aspects of landscape need to be assessed, not just physical elements.	District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council		cultural and social value and association. The format of the landscape effects is considered to be appropriate in that Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides a summary of the significant effects, with all effects set out in full in the appendices. This is a standard industry practice in the presentation of the Environmental Statements.
Landscape and visual amenity	While the principle of a detailed local landscape base is welcome, this should be developed and agreed in consultation with the relevant local authorities prior to its use in the Environmental Statement.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities prior to the Environmental Statement on the extent of the local landscape character areas and their relationship to the published landscape character assessments. This information is presented in chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10E.
Landscape and visual amenity	The mitigation proposals across the scheme are too homogenous and, in some areas, inappropriate to the extent that the adverse effect of the proposed mitigation planting is potentially greater than the adverse effects of the solar plant proposals. (Isleham / La Hogue Road/ Golf Links Road/ B1085 view out of Chippenham and possibly other locations). Further details are required about specific mitigation planting that is suitable for	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The mitigation proposals are not considered homogenous as they are based on hedgerows and woodlands, as found in the landscape, to reflect the existing landscape character. This has been based on the landscape character areas and observed existing vegetation. The Applicant's proposed mitigation as submitted can be found in chapter 10 and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	the different identified landscape character areas. Planting proposals should be based on the landscape character and observed existing vegetation. The Applicant should provide an effective and locally appropriate scheme of mitigation reflecting the local characteristics of the different areas in which the Scheme is built – detailed discussions with the Councils is essential if these issues are to be resolved.			Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	There are concerns about the visual impact on PROWs. This includes the various different users of the network, with viewpoints not being covered for equestrian use as previously agreed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the potential visual impact of the Scheme from a variety of receptors, including from equestrian users. The assessment includes photographs from publicly accessible locations which can be accessed by horse, but the photographs are taken at eye height, not from a horse. The assessment considers both equestrian users and pedestrians for the assessment where relevant. Details of these assessments can be found in chapter of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the photomontages provided within the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The Applicant has agreed the locations of the viewpoints with the host authorities.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	It is not sufficient to state that from no visual receptor can the entire development be viewed and bury the findings within the appendices that assess landscape and visual effects and not summarise them in the main report. It is further necessary that the sequential aspects of moving through the area are thoroughly assessed for all users, and that it is fully understood how the perception, that users have of the landscape within and around the Scheme, is affected by the proposals.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has not buried the findings of the assessment in the appendices. The appendices are a standard way of communicating the likely effects to a high number of visual receptors, with Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] providing a summary of the likely significant effects. Sequential aspects of moving through the landscape are covered by several locations along PROW and roads being included within the visual assessment. The statement that no receptor can see all of the Scheme is valid as part of identifying the likely cumulative effects to a change in the view.
Landscape and visual amenity	There is concern as to the impact of glint and glare, noting proposals to use planting to mitigate the impact will take a number of years to establish. There is concern regarding glint and glare for equestrian users south of Sunnica West site A. Proposals should investigate methods to mitigate these impacts in the years before the planting is established. Receptor heights have not been covered fully for equestrian use for the public rights of way network, with a number of routes not	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has considered the potential glint and glare impacts of the Scheme in Appendix 16A Glint and Glare Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted with the Applicant's DCO application. This assessment has considered the glint and glare impact, and wider visual impact on equestrian receptors. Details of the viewpoints assessed can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3] and Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	assessed at the increased height detailed in the assessment.			
Landscape and visual amenity	No reference can be found in the PEIR for assessment of views for equestrian users as visual receptors (separate from glint and glare).	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the potential visual impact of the Scheme for equestrian users, they are included as the receptors from viewpoints 13A, 15, 15A, 15B, 16, 17, 38, 39, 39c. Details of these assessments can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the photographs provided within the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Landscape and visual amenity	Some additional viewpoints are still missing (most importantly along the avenue towards the entrance of Chippenham Hall, but also from B1085 looking south-east into the Sunnica West A (slightly north-east of viewpoint 32) and the directionality of viewpoints on maps is still inaccurate in places and double arrows are unhelpful.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has provided details of these additional viewpoints in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	With regard to Appendix 10B High Level Tree Constraints Report, the PEIR confirms that further survey is required, and this should be undertaken to inform the ES and the DCO application.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has undertaken this assessment, the results of which are presented in Appendix 10B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Landscape and visual amenity	The impact of lighting has not been sufficiently considered in the landscape section.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Lighting has been considered within the construction and decommissioning assessments. During operation, permanent lighting with motion sensors will be installed within the substations and BESS compounds, providing a maximum of 50 lux. Any night works required on the PV modules during operation will use mobile lighting towers. In standard operating conditions there will be no lighting as a result of the Scheme and it is therefore, considered not to result in significant effects and is therefore scoped out of the assessment [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The Council expect that the Scheme will be reviewed, and tree losses avoided and minimised, for example along cable route A, between Sunnica East Site B and Sunnica West Site A at Heath Plantation; here the cable route is still shown to cut through a woodland, which the High-Level Tree Constraints Plan identifies as a group likely to be of high value. The alignment of the cable route corridor should be amended so that it avoids the woodland entirely.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has amended the cable route corridor to avoid the woodland at Heath Plantation. This amendment can be viewed in the parameter plans included in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3] and as secured through the limits of deviation shown on the Works Plans.
Landscape and visual amenity	It is essential that a suitably qualified arboriculturist is appointed as soon as possible to advise on tree matters at the detailed design stage, to supervise any tree works throughout the construction of the scheme (including installation of tree protection fencing, tree work, construction within close proximity to trees) and to produce a post completion inspection report detailing the condition of all trees that may have been affected by the works carried out.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A suitably qualified arboriculturist has been engaged since the early stages of the Scheme to inform the design and draft the High Level Tree Constraints Report, Appendix 10B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The arboriculturists qualifications are set out in the same appendix.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	With regard to the work in the PEIR, the susceptibility criteria are ill defined and generic rather than specific. All assessments should be carried out against the current proposals as they stand. The 'likelihood of undue consequences' is not a criterion for susceptibility. It is the susceptibility of a particular site to the changes resulting from a specific scheme that determines the likelihood of undue consequences. In order to establish the susceptibility of a specific area of a specific landscape to change caused by a specific development the criteria need to be landscape based and should include aspects like landform, location (valley – valleyside – plateau), characteristic vegetation, local landscape character, tranquillity.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities to develop its methodology, including susceptibility criteria, prior to the preparation of the Environmental Statement. The susceptibility criteria consider aspects like landform and location, vegetation patterns and local character. These aspects of susceptibility were considered in the PEI Report as well. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	With regard to landscape sensitivity, the criteria to discern 'medium' and 'low' sensitivity seem to be too similar and we suggest losing the 'very low' category and use its criteria for the 'low sensitivity' category. Otherwise, there is a danger that landscapes of community and local value may slide too easily into the 'very low sensitivity' category. Looking at the provided tables more holistically, we cannot see much difference between Landscape Sensitivity and Landscape Value. There are no categories for landscapes/ sites that have limited or very low value, because they are degraded, yet have little capacity for further adverse change, but could benefit from improvement. Nor does there appear to be a category for highly valued landscapes of national importance that may be able to accommodate a certain degree of change, because of factors in the landscape.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	As part of the discussion between the Applicant and the LPAs, the Applicant has set out why the use of the high, medium, low and very low categories are appropriate. There is no danger that landscape of community or local value slide into the category of very low sensitivity. This is because the defining criteria for very low sensitivity are for landscapes which exhibit none of the characteristics defined by published landscape character assessment, which is not the case for local and community valued landscapes. There are categories for landscape which have a very low value and landscapes which are highly valued. This is also evident by the assessment in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] not assigning very low sensitivity to the local and community valued landscapes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	There is a need to question statements such as: 10.6.201 The susceptibility of the LLCA mainly ranges between low to high. The low susceptibility is due to many developed areas or fields without landscape features such that development could be accommodated. The high susceptibility is due to Conservation Areas, or defined 'stud' landscapes, with limited ability to accommodate change. (PEIR, p.10-55) In particular around Isleham, but also south-west of La Hogue Road, wide open spaces with few features are part of the character and highly susceptible to change.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The sensitivity of the Local Landscape Character Areas (LLCA), including around Isleham have been reviewed prior to the preparation of the Environmental Statement following discussions with the host authorities on the LVIA methodology and the extent of the LLCA. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The mitigation does not always appear appropriate for the local landscape character/type, in some cases, to the extent that the mitigation planting itself has a greater adverse effect than the development proposals.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The mitigation proposals are considered appropriate for the local landscape character, and are based on hedgerows and woodlands, as found in the landscape. We do not agree with the suggestion that the mitigation planting has a greater adverse effect than the development proposals.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The mitigation embedded in the proposals has been accounted for in assessing glint and glare; this could be problematic, as the mitigation philosophy and resulting mitigation measures have not been agreed with the LPAs and are subject to change. In addition, the mitigation will take some time to establish and become effective. Reassessment may be required once mitigation planting is finalised and agreed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	It is standard practice to base an assessment of the proposed mitigation as part of the EIA process and therefore it is appropriate for the Glint and Glare assessment to adopt this approach.
Landscape and visual amenity	The PEIR references native and non-native evergreen species to be planted next to the temporary hoarding; clarification is required which species are proposed here, particularly which- non-native species.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The details are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, which is Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The proposed species are Pedunculate Oak (<i>Quercus robur</i>); English Elm (<i>Ulmus minor</i>); Field Maple; Birch; and Scots Pine.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	There is also concern over the impact on equestrian use on the PRow and impact on viewpoint 40 (PEIR) with regard to early morning impacts when this route receives high use.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the potential visual impact of the Scheme for a variety of receptors, including from equestrian users, including at viewpoint 40. Details of these assessments can be found in chapter of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The geometric calculation results do not give a true interpretation of the impact for the Public Right of Way network as detailed in 8.8 of the assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Additional viewpoints have been included in the landscape and visual assessment to account for PRow users. The methodology is presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The geometric calculations for impacts resulting from glint and glare are provided within Appendix 16A: Glint and Glare Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A single reflection point on the module has been chosen for the geometric calculations. This will suitably determine whether a reflection can be experienced at a location and the general time of year and duration of this reflection. Increased accuracy could be achieved by increasing the number of heights assessed

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				however this would only marginally change the results and is not considered significant enough to change the conclusions of the report. However, the height above ground level has been considered within the assessment for human and equestrian users of the PRoW to ensure the assessment accounts for the 'eye-level' of the receptor.
Landscape and visual amenity	The details provided of landscape planting presented in the OLEMP, including tree species and sizes trees, hedgerow planting and replacement are too generic, and therefore not acceptable in their current form. Landscape proposals including tree planting, and new grassland creation should be tailored to the location and conditions, noting that these change across the DCO site. Specific management prescriptions will be required. Both landscape proposals and management prescriptions should be detailed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has revised the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP), which is Appendix 10I of Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The species and planting proposals are tailored to their location and conditions, along with specific management to address these local variations. Given the outline nature of the application it is considered appropriate that management and prescriptions are in outline, as the detailed design would be undertaken post consent with matters agreed with the host authorities at that stage, pursuant to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	Where hedges are being retained and relied on for mitigation of landscape effects, the condition of the hedgerow needs to be established and management prescriptions should be made clear.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Management of retained hedgerows is set out in the OLEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and details of the existing vegetation is set out in the High-Level Tree Constraints Report, submitted as Appendix 10B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Landscape and visual amenity	5m buffers around panel fields – please confirm that these will not be used for access.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The access points and internal access roads are indicated on the Access and Rights of Way Plans [EN010106/APP/2.3] and where practicable have been located within the PV module layout. In any event, it is considered that the access points do not impede the ability to provide landscape buffers which vary in distance.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The provision of photomontages does not appear to be sufficient, particularly for Sunnica West and around Burwell substation. It is suggested that Viewpoints 41, 46 and 54/55 are reconsidered.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Noting these comments we have included locations 41, 46 and 54. We consider that 55 is not required given its proximity to 54.
Landscape and visual amenity	There is no evidence that a colour study has been undertaken. This should form part of the design code for these built features.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The importance of colour has been incorporated into the mitigation within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2] for the BESS to be rendered in a suitable colour which is sympathetic to the landscape. The details of this can be addressed at detail design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The landscape proposals should respond to the landscape character typology.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	We consider that the landscape proposals have responded to the landscape character typology including native trees, hedgerows and new chalk grassland and the retention of existing vegetation.
Landscape and visual amenity	The embedded landscape mitigation in 10.7.5 of the PEIR in general lacks detail. There are no minimum offsets and the minimum width of tree belts is not detailed. A tree belt of 5m in width will perform differently from one of 15m or 30m wide.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The embedded mitigation, in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and OLEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out details on the siting, landscape measures and approach to reduce the likely impacts of the Scheme, including details of the proposed planting widths.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	There is concern that the methodology is calibrated in a way that may put more of the expected effects into the non-significant bracket. This could be mitigated by the professional judgement in the narrative. However, this cannot be verified for Viewpoint 33, north-west of La Hogue Road, at the junction with La Hogue Farm. It is difficult to follow the judgement that the change of view by year 15 from wide open landscape to looking up close onto the edge of a tree belt as far as the eye can see can result in a negligible effect.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The methodology has been revised following discussions with the host authority and the Scheme design has also changed in relation to La Hogue Farm. Please refer to Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] for the updated assessment to viewpoint 33.
Landscape and visual amenity	The following additional viewpoints are required: An additional viewpoint is required from Devil's Dyke. An additional viewpoint is required from the avenue leading from the original main entrance to Chippenham estate looking in all directions, from a suitable location, where the extent of the PV panels on either side of the avenue and the resulting effects on the setting are evident. This should be a Type 4 visualisation (photomontage). An additional viewpoint is required from	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	These locations have been included in the assessment: - additional view form Devil's Dyke as viewpoint 59 - additional view from main entrance as Heritage viewpoint 11 - B0185 as viewpoint 34A - Fordham House as viewpoint 48 - the road to West Row as viewpoint 2c

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	B1085 looking south-east into the Sunnica West A. An additional viewpoint is required for the proposed redline change at Biggin Farm A142. Fordham House is a Grade II Listed Building and will need to be assessed as a visual receptor. Any potential effects on the setting of Fordham House will also need to be assessed (Cultural Heritage). View to E33 from the road to West Row.			
Consultation	The UK Solar PV Strategy requires proposals to be appropriately sited, with proper weight given to environmental considerations and provide opportunities for local communities to influence decisions that affect them. Insufficient attention has been paid to the views of the local communities and there is little evidence to demonstrate that the local communities have had any meaningful input to the scheme design.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant considers the proposal to be appropriately sited and has amended the Sunnica Energy Farm design in response to the results of its environmental surveys and feedback received through the statutory consultation. As set out in Chapter 6 of this report, these changes include: Removing parcels E11 and E23 from solar development to set the Sunnica Energy Farm back from Worlington. These parcels now form part of area ECO3 shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] Removing parcel E07 from solar development to reduce the landscape and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				visual impact of the Sunnica Energy Farm for people travelling between Freckenham and Isleham. This area now forms an ecological mitigation area, ECO2 which is also shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES. In addition to this, the Applicant has removed parcels W13, W14 and W16 (as shown Figure 4-5 of the ES) from the Order limits which in total means that the Scheme has reduced in size. Further information on how the Applicant has considered the local and national planning context when choosing the Sunnica Energy Farm sites is provided in Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], and the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. Detail of how the Applicant has had regard to responses received through the consultation can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The PEIR addresses the potential interaction of effects caused by the Scheme and has also identified other developments in the area that may lead to cumulative effects. It has, however, not sufficiently addressed and reported on the potential intra-cumulative effects.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted with the Applicant's DCO application includes details of potential intra-cumulative effects in Chapter 17: Effect Interactions of the Environmental Statement.
EIA process	The methodology for dealing with intra and inter cumulative effects of the project should be agreed prior to preparation of Environmental Statement to avoid uncommon ground in this area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has further engaged with the host authorities following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. This has informed the Applicant's methodology for addressing inter and intra cumulative effects. Further information can be found in Chapter 5: EIA Methodology and Chapter 17: Effect Interactions of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	If the BESS is a temporary part of the Scheme, this should be assessed as part of the EIA activity.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The BESS will be a permanent part of the Scheme and will be in place throughout the operational lifetime of the Scheme. It has been assessed for all topics within the Environmental Statement.
EIA process	Geographical location, local weather patterns, pollution levels and damage or failure of key components are some of the important factors influencing the overall effectiveness of solar PV. The Applicant should provide further detail to demonstrate that such factors have been taken into account including, for example, whether damage from bird strikes has been considered.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant considered a number of factors when choosing the location of the Sunnica Energy Farm, this included geographical location. Further information is provided in Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	It is considered that the option of 'No Development' should be included in the Environmental Statement in sufficient detail given the extent of land that will be occupied by the scheme and the adverse effects it may have on soil and carbon storage and any future options to increase the carbon sequestration from this considerable land area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	NPS EN-1 Section 4.4 sets out the principles by which the Secretary of State should be guided by with regard to the weight given to alternatives. Bullet 2 of paragraph 4.4.3 states 'the IPC should be guided in considering alternative proposals by whether there is a realistic prospect of the alternative delivering the same infrastructure capacity (including energy security and climate change benefits) in the same timescale as the proposed development'. For this reason, the option of 'No Development' has not been included within the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on carbon and have considered sequestration as an impact of the Scheme as presented in Chapter 6 [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The assessment shows that the land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. Similarly, allowing the land within the Scheme to lie fallow for 40 years will have benefits for the soil quality within the Scheme, see Chapter 2

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.1]. The 'Do Nothing' would be the absence of those beneficial impacts.
EIA process	Where outline management plans are to be presented with the DCO application the Applicant should ensure that, where relevant, interactions between the plans are considered. Where mitigation measures in one plan are reliant on measures in another plan this should be clearly referenced, and appropriate mechanisms put in place to secure delivery of such measures.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the interaction between the various management plans included within its DCO application. Relevant management plans are clearly referenced in each where mitigation measures are reliant on measures in another plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The GLVIA 3 advises that the assessment of sensitivity should not be recorded as part of the landscape baseline. The methodology used does not appear to have followed this principle.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	In terms of an assessment of sensitivity, this is included in the assessment of effects, with the supporting information provided in the baseline reviews, to reflect the analysis of value, which is assessed in the baseline and susceptibility, which again is about the baseline situation.
Planning	The village of Witchford has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan that it is not referenced in the Applicant's assessment of policies in East Cambridgeshire.	East Cambridgeshire District Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the latest local planning policy context for the Scheme including adopted Neighbourhood Plans. This is discussed in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant notes that the village of Witchford has an adopted neighbourhood plan however this is west of Ely and not considered relevant in terms of the Scheme's planning policy context given its distance from the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Planning	The PEIR does not take into account that West Suffolk policy DM13 identifies the Brecks as a valued landscape which has “by reason of their landform, historic landscape importance and/or condition, a very limited capacity to absorb change without a significant material effect on their character and/or condition.”	West Suffolk Council	Yes	Policy DM13 is included and accounted for within Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Planning	Freckenham has an emerging Neighbourhood Plan including the Freckenham Landscape Character Assessment which is published on the parish council website.	West Suffolk Council	Yes	The Applicant has considered the latest local planning policy context for the Scheme including adopted Neighbourhood Plans. This is discussed in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. As Freckenham's Neighbourhood Plan is not yet made and no emerging version is available it is not considered at this stage. Chapter 10 Landscape and visual amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has considered the Freckenham Landscape Character Assessment

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The potential for, a shuttle bus or holding non-critical journeys away from the site should be part of the Travel Plan.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan (TP) (Appendix 13C of the ES) has been produced with details of the staff parking strategy included. Two centralised car parks are identified, one within Sunnica East and one within Sunnica West. Internal routes will be used to transport staff around the Site or where this is not possible the use of mini-buses will be used to transport staff to areas of the site. It is identified within the Framework CTMP and TP that there is the potential for the mini-bus to pick-up/drop-off staff within local residential areas and PT hubs to reduce the number of staff vehicles to/from the site.
Transport and Access	The councils would advocate that the promoter looks to agree relevant assessment methodologies with the highway authorities prior to submission of the DCO.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and through this engagement has agreed assessment methodologies with the highways authorities that have informed the development of the Applicant's Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and assessment of transport impacts contained within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	An understanding of how vehicle journeys will be distributed across the sites is required in order to aid the understanding of the key issues and would assist the Applicant in developing a travel plan and recommendations to manage journeys that can actually be implemented.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details regarding the distribution of the vehicles are provided within the Transport Assessment as part of Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan has been produced and is presented in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A requirement of the DCO will ensure that the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan will be developed by the appointed contractor into detailed plans.
Transport and Access	Does the Applicant intend to make provision for any temporary living accommodation on site for staff and/or make land available for privately owned accommodation to be sited?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant does not intend to make provision for any temporary living accommodation on site for staff. A detailed description of the Scheme is set out in Chapter 3 - Scheme Description [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The location of the office/warehouse at Sunnica East Site A is questioned given the amount of vehicular traffic that will need to use the local road network to access the site. The office/warehouse would be better located at parcel E18 where there is access from the major road network. It is unclear from the parameter plans what is occurring on parcel E23.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has had regard to feedback received through the statutory consultation and is no longer proposing to develop at parcel E23, which will instead be used for native grassland planting which forms part of area ECO3 in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Following further engagement with the local highway authorities, the Applicant is proposing to locate compounds at both E18 and E33, see Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3], due to the proximity to the Strategic Highway Network and landowner requirements on the Scheme. Further details regarding the transport and access plans can be found within Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 - Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The councils have concerns about the widths of the public highways being proposed as access routes by HGVs in paragraph 5.7 of the Transport Assessment for both the construction and operation of the Scheme. While access may have been used by agricultural vehicles, the intensification of use is likely to require improvements to make them acceptable. Improvements to the operational accesses shall be permanent whereas temporary access may require reinstatement.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) (see sections 5 and 6 and Annex C) has been produced which includes details of the site accesses has been considered in relation to swept path analysis, visibility splays and indicative site access layouts. Hard standing surface is also to be provided at the site accesses to ensure they are acceptable for the vehicles required to use them.
Transport and Access	The Applicant's attention is drawn to the requirement to prevent water and debris being brought or allowed to flow onto the public highway. It is presumed that the HGVs for fuel and waste mentioned in paragraph 5.18 of the Transport Assessment will be to the primary access and that more details will be supplied in the application.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan (TP) (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) has been produced which includes a number of different measures to mitigate the potential for construction traffic movements to harm the condition of public highways. Within the Framework CTMP and TP [EN010106/APP/6.2] it is identified that wheel washing facilities will be provided in Section 6. HGVs for fuel and waste will be expected to predominantly use the two main site entrances, however there may be exceptions to this and these will be determined prior to construction. Appropriate mitigation

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				measures would be put in place to ensure minimal disruption.
Transport and Access	The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should cap HGVs to 10 per hour as assessed (7.2) and staff vehicle trips (7.3) should similarly be controlled.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The HGV and staff vehicle trips are not proposed to be capped; however, details of the proposed measures and controls are provided in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). These measures will ensure that the effects are no greater than those identified in the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Paragraph 5.19 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan provides additional detail on this suggesting 101 HGV deliveries per day and further understanding is needed as to whether this figure should be assessed within the Environmental Statement. It implies that the peak deliveries across Sunnica West, Sunnica East, Cable Routes and Substation will be staggered. Further details of the vehicle movements during the construction of the project will be required to demonstrate this and to aid selection of appropriate controls in the CTMP. As above, further evidence or controls and monitoring is needed for the figures associated with the following: • Construction workforce • Workforce car share • Workforce shift patterns • Minibus proposals	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The impact of the HGVs on the strategic road network are identified in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Details are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) in relation to controls and monitoring in Section 6. Information is provided within the Framework CTMP and TP in relation to the split of HGVs across the scheme and in relation to the Applicant's proposals to further reduce staff movements to and from the Order limits, including the promotion of car sharing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Further details are required on the proposed provision and facilities. A profile of access to / from car parks should be provided – 434 in and out in an hour, 7 / min on a single-track road.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) Sunnica East car park is accessed via Elms Road and Sunnica West car park is accessed via La Hogue Road. Both roads provide two-way movements for cars.
Transport and Access	Further details of the connection of the access tracks will need to be provided to show that they are safe to use, with the need for an adequate length of access road that is of a suitable width to allow two vehicles to pass safely and that this is not obstructed by gates preventing vehicles leaving the public highway. The access roads will need to be designed to prevent trafficking of mud and debris or the flow of water onto the public highway.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which includes of the site accesses including swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and traffic management is provided within Section 5.10 and Annex C of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Wheel washing facilities will be provided – this is detailed within Section 6 of the Framework CTMP and TP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and a measure is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				included within Appendix 16C: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport and Access	The Transport Assessment does not appear to include workers and vehicle movement for Burwell Substation only internal substations. Not clear if civil engineering and / or electrical work refer to this or to the cable corridors.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of HGVs and staff trips to Burwell substation are provided within sections 5 and 6 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	It is noted as part of the boundary changes there is an additional access near to the Burwell substation entrance described as Weirs Drove. It needs to be made clear the routing of construction traffic for this additional access. It is worth noting the nearest adopted highway to the access is via Anchor Lane which is in a residential area. Alternatively, it could be via Weirs Drove and Byway (35/7b). This route passes residential properties as well as Burwell Recreation Ground. The impact on Weirs Drove and the Byway and/or routing to Anchor Lane will need to be assessed for their suitability.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is committed to providing clear routing for construction traffic to the designated access points at each site. The Applicant has assessed the potential impact of construction traffic relating to the Scheme on Weirs Drove and Anchor Lane and the impacts are not considered significant. See Section 6 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and in Section 3, Section 5 and Annex B the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	U6003/6004 Elms Road is used to travel from the A11 to access points A, B and C is signed as unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles due to its narrow width. Evidence of vehicle over-run is present. In the LHA's opinion, the provision of passing places alone will not be sufficient to allow safe passage of vehicles along Elm's Road particularly during peak periods and that significant lengths of this road will need to be widened, which may in turn require removal of hedgerows.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the traffic management as well as swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts along Elms Road is provided within Section 5, and Annex C of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Where it is required, details of removal of vegetation is covered within sections 8.8 and 10. 8 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation and Chapter 10 Landscape and visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]), respectively.
Transport and Access	Figures J1 and J2 of the Access Strategy show workers trip using the access to the west of Elms Road (B) while all other documents show the car park is to the east (A). Due to the proximity of the temporary construction area adjacent to Sunnica East access B and the temporary car park at access A, the option of walking between sites appears practical provided safe access can be provided across Elms Road.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	All access points off the highway need to be appropriately designed and constructed to the relevant highways authority's standards. Early engagement with highway engineers is encouraged.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of providing safe and appropriate access points to all of the sites and has further engaged with the highways authorities and Highways England following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. This has facilitated further discussions on the location and design of access points to the sites. Details are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and Annex C which includes site accesses including swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and traffic management.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Where existing accesses are to be utilised, further detail in respect of any upgrades or improvements required should be included in the DCO submission.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided details of proposed upgrades to existing access points within the Rights of Way and Access Plans [EN010106/APP/2.3] and the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and Annex C which includes site accesses including swept path analysis, visibility splays and indicative site access layouts.
Transport and Access	C610 Newmarket Road to Sunnica East accesses D and H narrows travelling north away from the A11 and also shows signs of vehicles overrunning the verge but is generally wide enough for most vehicles to pass each other. Removal of vegetation is likely to provide visibility for safe use of the access.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the traffic management is provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan (TP) (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Details are provided within Section 3 and Annex C of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which includes information on the site accesses including swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and traffic management. Highway conditional surveys are committed as part of the Framework CTMP and TP document outlined in Section 7. Details of removal of vegetation is covered

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				within sections 8.8 and 10. 8 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation and Chapter 10 Landscape and visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]), respectively.
Transport and Access	C613 Golf Links Road leading to Sunnica East access I is also narrow with a relatively tight junction onto Newmarket Road.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The site access on Golf Links Road has been reviewed based on consultation feedback. The site access has been relocated to Newmarket Road and Sunnica vehicles are now not required to travel along Golf Links Road. Consultation with National Highways (previously Highways England) agreed on permitting Sunnica vehicles to turn left from the A11 onto Newmarket Road and left from Newmarket Road to the A11, prohibiting Sunnica vehicles to turn right at the A11/Newmarket Road junction. Details are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Travel Plan Section 3 and Annex C. The proposed temporary traffic regulation measures will be shown on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [EN010106/APP/2.4] and the locations of the site accesses are shown in the Access and Rights of Way plans [EN010106/APP/2.3].
Transport and Access	Golf Links Road is a narrow road, used by recreational walkers and cyclists and is, therefore, not suitable for HGVs. The road has hedgerows tight to the carriageway in many places which limits the ability to mitigate highway impacts through increased width or passing places for example. This road should not, therefore, form any part of a routing plan for HGVs.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The site access on Golf Links Road has been reviewed based on consultation feedback. The site access has been relocated to Newmarket Road and Sunnica vehicles are now not required to travel along Golf Links Road. Consultation with National Highways (previously Highways England) agreed on permitting Sunnica vehicles to turn left from the A11 onto Newmarket Road and left from Newmarket Road to the A11, prohibiting Sunnica vehicles to turn right at the A11/Newmarket Road junction. Details are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Travel Plan Section

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				3 and Annex C. Details of removal of vegetation is covered within sections 8.8 and 10.8 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation and Chapter 10 Landscape and visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]), respectively. The proposed temporary traffic regulation measures will be shown on the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [EN010106/APP/2.4] and the locations of the site accesses are shown in the Access and Rights of Way plans [EN010106/APP/2.3].
Transport and Access	The Scheme is close to Mildenhall which has considerable growth planned. For example, works are already underway for the Mildenhall Hub. There remains concern about constraints at key junctions within Mildenhall which will be difficult to mitigate. Cumulative traffic impacts need to be taken into account, not just for projects with planning permission but also allocated in local plans. Evidence is available through the cumulative impact transport study produced by AECOM for the former Forest Heath area Local Plan.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has carried out an assessment of cumulative traffic impacts, taking into account development planned at Mildenhall. Information has been used from the Forest Heath Local Plan Study. Further information can be found in the Applicant's Transport Assessment in Section 3 (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	In the long term, constraints at key junctions within Mildenhall will become more difficult to mitigate without further modal shift and the potential for some form additional road capacity has been raised, including a relief road at paragraph 8.4.89 of the Transport Study. The Sunnica proposal should not compromise this longer-term aspiration or longer-term development potential of Mildenhall that might be brought forward through the emerging West Suffolk Plan.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has carried out an assessment of cumulative traffic impacts, taking into account development planned at Mildenhall. Further information can be found in the Applicant's Construction Transport Assessment Report (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The Applicant has considered the local planning context within the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. The Scheme has been brought forward in knowledge of the future development of Mildenhall and the Applicant does not view the Scheme as representing a constraint to this future growth.
Transport and Access	The Councils question why existing farm tracks and accesses are not being utilised, for example, the internal road network in and around Bay Farm could be utilised instead of Golf Links Road. The suitability of an access point at E33 is also questioned, with access via E10 appearing more logical.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Where possible, accesses to the Order limits are using existing farm tracks and accesses. However, land agreements provide limits on where some of those locations can be provided such as at the land to the south of Golf Links Road. The route through Bay Farm is not possible without landowner agreement. The site access on Golf Links Road has been reviewed based on consultation feedback. The site access has been relocated to Newmarket Road and Sunnica vehicles are

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				now not required to travel along Golf Links Road. Consultation with National Highways (previously Highways England) agreed on permitting Sunnica vehicles to turn left from the A11 onto Newmarket Road and left from Newmarket Road to the A11, prohibiting Sunnica vehicles to turn right at the A11/Newmarket Road junction. Details are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Travel Plan Section 3 and Annex C. The proposed temporary traffic regulation measures will be shown on the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [EN010106/APP/2.4] and the locations of the site accesses are shown in the Access and Rights of Way plans [EN010106/APP/2.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The Applicant states that open cut trenching will be the primary method used for crossing the public highways. The councils would prefer trenchless techniques to be used under highways to protect the fabric of the highway and reduce disruption to road users by temporary traffic management, except where this would have an unacceptable impact on archaeology.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of reducing disruption to road users when trenching across public highways. As a result, the time taken to cross public highways will be kept to a minimum and where possible the public highway will be kept at least partially open during this process and a traffic management system will be put in place. Public highways will be reinstated following backfilling of trenches. Further information on this is provided in Chapter 13 - Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Transport and Access	The C603 leading off the B1102 to Sunnica East access E is also a narrow single-track road, while the width of the C608 leading to accesses F and G allows two cars to pass but not HGVs.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the traffic management and the site access reviews including swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts are provided in Section 3 and Annex C within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Details of removal of vegetation is covered within sections 8.8 and 10.8 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]), respectively.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The proposed temporary traffic regulation measures will be shown on the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [EN010106/APP/2.4] and the locations of the site accesses are shown in the Rights of Way Plans [EN010106/APP/2.3].
Transport and Access	The C753 Snailwell Short Road reduces in width travelling north from the A142 towards Sunnica West access B and F with significant traffic calming adjacent to Plantation Stud and a hump backed bridge over the rail line. While widths are adequate for two cars to pass it would not allow two HGVs to pass.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The access point on Chippenham Road will be sited at the existing access to Chippenham Park approximately 500m north-east of the junction with the Street, Newmarket Road and Snailwell Short Road. This is site access B; details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). Swept path analysis and visibility splays have been used to design the access points, and it is considered that this access point is safe for HGV access.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Details of the HGV routes and traffic management is provided within sections 3 and 6 in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.
Transport and Access	We note that there is no preferred route published by DfT for high and heavy loads to travel between local ports and Burwell substation. Therefore, there is no protection against changes to such routes to permit future use for this purpose.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) has been produced which includes details of AILs as contained within table 2.1 in Section 2. A crane route review was also carried out with details provided within Section 5 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The site is well located in proximity to the Strategic Road Network and therefore the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Applicant is confident that it will be possible to organise AIL transits to the site when required.
Transport and Access	In many cases the roads proposed to be used for access do not allow two cars to pass safely and certainly not HGVs. Significant improvements may be required to provide safe access for the construction and operational phases.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the traffic management and the site access reviews including swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts are provided in Section 3 and Annex C within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Details of removal of vegetation is covered within sections 8.8 and 10.8 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]), respectively.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Paragraph 3.6.12 of the PEIR sets out that the peak construction workforce is expected to be 1,260 on the average day. This has been assumed to mean the average day at peak construction and information is sought as to what the peak workforce day is, or at least how much variance there is likely to be between the average and the absolute peak.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided details of the expected peak construction workforce numbers, the time period for when this is expected, and the variance between the average and absolute peak. This information can be found in Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	The assessment is based on an assessment of change in development peak hours, rather than network peak hours. These peak hours are identified as 06:00 to 07:00 and 19:00 to 20:00, which is said to reflect construction shift patterns. Little evidence is submitted to confirm that these hours of assessment are reasonable, especially considering that a large number of the conclusions that have been drawn by the Applicant are based on impacts occurring during these hours (i.e. not the network peak hours). It is the councils' opinion that the environmental impacts should be assessed more widely as for example peaks in receptor movements such	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The methodology used when assessing the potential transportation magnitude of change of the proposed Scheme on Vehicle Travellers, Non-Motorised Users (NMU) and Public Transport Users has been based on IEMA guidance in combination with professional judgement in relation to the number of forecast staff vehicles and the characteristics of the link and receptors.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	as walkers or cyclists may not correspond with movements of construction traffic.			
Transport and Access	Some of the minor access roads leading to secondary access points have not been considered in paragraph 13.4.5 of the Transport Assessment. The promoter has not demonstrated that trips using these accesses are low enough for them to be scoped out. We are concerned about the absence of data on pedestrian and cycle movement and any conclusion that is drawn from impacts on this basis, especially when concluding that impacts would not occur due to the absence of pedestrians and cycles.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details regarding the site accesses is provided within Section 5 and Annex C of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) including swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and traffic management. NMUs have been assessed within the Environmental Statement in Chapter 13.8. Forecast peak and average daily HGVs single directional trips are identified in the Framework CTMP and TP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Paragraph 2.2.21 within the Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out the total staff employees and vehicle movements. It is expected that monitoring and controls will be in place to ensure that these figures are not exceeded. This will be required to be enshrined through a relevant legal agreement within the DCO.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of appropriate enforcement and monitoring of employee vehicle movements during construction. The application includes a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which includes within, Section 6 measures in relation to the monitoring of the efficacy of the traffic mitigation measures. The requirements of the draft DCO secure compliance with the measures included in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan.
Transport and Access	Paragraph 2.2.24 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out the staff shift patterns. It is expected that monitoring and controls will be in place to ensure that these shift patterns are used. This will be required to be enshrined through a relevant legal agreement within the DCO.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of minimising the disruption caused by construction. The application includes a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which includes within Section 6 measures in relation to the monitoring of the efficacy of the traffic mitigation measures. The requirements of the draft DCO secure compliance with the measures included in the Framework

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan.
Transport and Access	Paragraphs 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan provide details of the Delivery Management System; the mechanism for ensuring HGV numbers, timing restrictions, identification, emissions standards and routes will need to be enshrined in an appropriate legal agreement within the DCO, including relevant enforcement measures.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of minimising construction traffic impacts during construction. The application includes a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) in Section 6 which relates to the management measures and Section 3 which identifies the HGV routes. The requirements of the draft DCO secure compliance with the measures included in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Paragraph 3.2.9 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out details of monitoring system with information on management provided at paragraphs 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. It is expected that all monitoring data will be recorded and reported quarterly to the relevant authorities, including any breaches that occur. Paragraph 3.2.14 states an average car occupancy is assumed to be 1.5 people per car. Monitoring of this will be required to ensure that this assumption is valid and thus car trips do not exceed those forecast.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance of minimising construction traffic impacts during construction. The application includes a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which is included in Section 6 for management and Section 7 in relation to compliance and enforcement. The requirements of the draft DCO secure compliance with the measures included in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan.
Transport and Access	With regard to the parking permit system set out at Paragraph 3.2.19, thought will need to be given on the working of the permit system to avoid drivers not in possession of a permit parking inappropriately in nearby communities. This may require monitoring.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided details of a parking permit system in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which provides staff a permit to part within one of the two centralised car parks and staff will be directed to not park beyond these two car parks. The exception is the small number of staff cars (up to five staff vehicles), forecast for the construction of the cable routes, which will park within the Order limits as outlined in Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The majority of the local roads are bounded by hedgerows. The creation and amendment of accesses might require removal of significant trees and hedgerows to provide adequate visibility for example. These will need to be assessed within the Landscape & Ecology chapters	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Access locations have been selected and designed to minimise vegetation removal as far as practicable. Site access reviews were undertaken which includes swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts as well as traffic management which is outlined in Section 5 and annex C of the Framework CTMP and TP (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). These identify areas where vegetation will need to be trimmed / removed in order to allow safe access for vehicles. The need for vegetation removal has been assessed in Chapter 8 and Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]/

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Figure 3 of the Access Strategy does not clearly show how HGV traffic from the A14 East accesses Sunnica West accesses A, C, D and E, but it is clear that many HGV routes use the A14 / A142 junction 37 at Newmarket. Understanding traffic movements at this junction are important not just in capacity terms, but also the impacts on road safety as there have been a number of accidents recorded at this location.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application which details the HGV construction routes. Site access reviews were undertaken which includes swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts as well as traffic management which is outlined in Section 5 and Annex C of the Framework CTMP and TP Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	Areas where collisions have been recorded are: • A11NB slip onto B1085/U6004 Elms Road (cluster at junction) • B1102 Freckenham Road (number west of Worlington) • A11 slip to C576 Newmarket Road • A11 C623 Herringswell Road crossover • A11 / A1101 roundabout Mildenhall and A11 south of this location • A14 / A142 J37 Newmarket. The scope for investigation should be agreed with the local highways authority (LHA)s.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant welcomes this information from the host authorities and has continued to engage with them following the statutory consultation. This engagement has assisted the Applicant in developing its scope for investigating impacts on the local highways network. Details of the assessments submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application can be found in Section 13.6, Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	While it is accepted that there are few alternatives to traffic U-turning at the A14/A142 junction this shows the importance of assessing impacts of the project at this location.			Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	With regards to Burwell Substation, the councils note that while special order AIL movements have been made between the Port of Ipswich and Burwell there is no preferred DfT route to this site. Therefore, this route has no protection for long term availability for this purpose.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) has been produced which includes details of AILs as contained within table 2.1 in Section 2. A crane route review was also carried out with details provided within Section 5 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The site is well located in proximity to the Strategic Road Network and therefore the Applicant is confident that it will be possible

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				to organise AIL transits to the site when required.
Transport and Access	It is expected that efforts will be made to reduce single occupancy vehicle movements by staff either through the Construction Traffic Management Plan or through a Travel Plan.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing initiatives to reduce traffic movement and encourage vehicle sharing. Further information is provided in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan Report (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]), compliance with which would be secured through a requirement to draft DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The proposed dismissal of impacts in the PEIR (paragraphs 13.4.7 and 13.4.8) of A142 / Landwade Road / Snailwell Road or A14 junction 38 are not accepted without further understanding of the development impacts, albeit that the A14 junction is the responsibility of Highways England. Absence of data is not considered a reasonable justification for not undertaking relevant assessment. Junction 38 has been modelled for local plans (e.g. Forest Heath Site Allocations Cumulative Traffic Impact Study) and past projects (e.g. past projects, for example for the Forest Heath Local Plan 20167 and for the Hatchfield Farm) development and the councils disagree with the removal this junction from the transport assessment and ES. Suffolk County Council would accept scoping out of the A142/Landwade Road/ Snailwell Road junction (paragraph 13.4.7), as stated by Cambridgeshire County Council in their scoping response.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The trip generation and distribution at these junctions are identified in Section 5 and Annex H of the Transport Assessment. Within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] the impact is discussed within Section 13.8. Additional historic traffic survey data has been obtained and is contained within Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	No evidence is submitted to support the shift patterns assessed nor relevant proposals on enforcement to ensure that the impacts are commensurate with those assessed. This brings into question the validity of the assessment and all of the conclusions on impacts that are subsequently drawn.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The applicant has proposed a range of measures to ensure that the impacts of construction worker vehicles are directed to times that fall outside of the network peak. Those measures are set out in the Framework Construction Management Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]), in Section 6 for management and Section 7 for compliance and enforcement. The requirements of the draft DCO secure compliance with the measures included in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan. It is considered therefore that the conclusions of the assessment are robust and reliable.
Transport and Access	The proposed assessment method is based on a worker vehicle car share factor of 1.5 persons per vehicle. Evidence of this level of car share being achieved at a similar development in a similar location should be submitted. Monitoring, enforcement and controls for achieving this level of car sharing needs to be embedded in relevant management plans, such as travel plan, otherwise the methodology cannot be agreed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Information is provided in Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) regarding the proposed car share factor. In the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]), management is identified in Section 6 and compliance and enforcement is identified in Section 7.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The existing levels of severance on each link should be determined, so that a baseline level of severance can be presented.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details are provided in Section 13.8 within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Severance has been assessed for each of the Sites, the Cable Corridor and Burwell Substation Extension to understand the impact of the Scheme. The assessment did not identify any significant effects, in relation to the Scheme.
Transport and Access	All areas where a 10% change in traffic flows occur should be identified and those areas that require further assessment on this basis should be agreed with the highways authorities.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1] assessment is based on IEMA guidance. The Applicant has assessed the areas where there is likely to be a 10% or greater change in traffic flows. The ES impact section identifies links where staff vehicles are forecast where baseline traffic data was available. Where baseline data is available the percentage change in traffic flows have been identified. The details of this are provided in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Consultation with the local highway authorities has been ongoing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Limited evidence is submitted to support the number of workers that is being projected for the sites' construction.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided further information on the projected number of workers involved during construction in Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	Consideration needs to be given to how severance is assessed within Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) document LA112. For clarity, the changes between traffic flows that result on a low, medium and high impacts are not agreed, as they are coarse and are assumed figures rather than having been tested. The methodology fails to assess impacts on different groups (e.g. young, disabled and elderly).	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has assessed severance according to the following methodology set out in the Institute of Environmental Assessment, (1994). 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic'. IEA, Horncastle which is contained within Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 in the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]). This methodology is considered robust for the EIA assessment as this is not a road Scheme. All different groups, including the young disabled and elderly, are captured within the overall non-motorised user (NMU) group as existing users of the local road and public right of way network. The different groups of NMUs have not been assessed independently and it is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				considered that this is an appropriate approach for this assessment.
Transport and Access	The highways authorities are not certain where the proposed determination for impacts on pedestrian delay originate from; there are limited recommendations within Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines for the Assessment of Road Traffic, and therefore the origin of these figures should be submitted.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Pedestrian and Cycle Delay is considered to be affected by the changes in volume, composition or speed of traffic, in terms of their respective changes on the ability of people to cross the roads. In general, increases in traffic levels and/or traffic speeds are likely to lead to greater increases in pedestrian delay. IEMA guidelines suggest that a 30%, 60% and 90% increase in traffic flows will result in a minor, moderate and major change in pedestrian and cycle delay respectively, as outlined in the IEMA guidance.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Details provided in Section 13.8 within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Transport and Access	The assertion that the PROWs have generally low pedestrian flows is not agreed. This is also excluding the consideration of cyclists and equestrian users, for example on bridleway 204/5. We would require surveys to be carried out on all PROW impacted by the proposals to quantify the actual amount of usage, so a reasonable assessment of the impact can be made. This would better inform the conclusions in the PEIR Non-Technical Summary which suggests the impact on PROW as being moderate (Pp 44 Paragraph 4.11.7). There are recommendations that the baseline level of pedestrian and cycle	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant shares the view of the local authorities that the routes should only be closed for the minimum period required to enable the related works to take place safely. The Applicant is not proposing to close all public rights of way (PROW) for the duration of the construction period, rather PROW closures will be for a maximum of three weeks each during construction, see Section 4 of the Framework CTMP and TP [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Given the short duration for which these will be closed, the magnitude of effect on PROW users is therefore considered to be reduced. Further details can be found in chapters 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Figures 3-13 and 3-14

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	movement be determined. For clarity, the proposed assessment method is not agreed.			of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] and the Traffic Regulation Measure Plans [EN010106/APP/2.4]. The point referred to in the PEIR Non-Technical Summary is the conclusion of the socio-economics assessment presented in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] (and Chapter 12 of the PEIR). The moderate adverse effect identified would be on users making local journeys on bridleways W-257/007/0, W-257/002/X and W-257/002/0 between Freckenham and Isleham. These users would experience temporary disruption due to these conjoining routes being temporarily severed, preventing access. Users would be able to use an alternative route via Beck Road (approximately 1km in additional journey length), to complete their journeys, though this route is also used by traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	A plan showing the links identified for the Transport Assessment and the sensitivity of these links should be provided prior to agreement of the extent of the study area and categorisation of each link. The extent of links and the categorisations of links is not considered to be clear.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has agreed the extent of the study area for the Scheme's Transport Assessment. Details of the assessment are provided in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The highway link sensitivity is outlined in Section 13.6 in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Transport and Access	No justification is given for the lack of a proposed method to assess the relative amenity of journeys that are affected by the development. Indeed, we note that the Transport Assessment paragraph 3.9 notes that the roads surrounding the site are generally lightly trafficked and therefore could encourage cycling. For clarity, the proposed assessment method is not agreed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has agreed the method of assessing the relative amenity of journeys likely to be impacted by the development. Details of the assessment are provided in sections 13.4 and 13.8 within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	For the assessment of transport effects, the distribution of population within the immediate MSOA has been used, clarification is needed on how this compares to the socio-economic assessment and use of the Cambridge Travel to Work Area for distributing staff. Further clarification is sought as to whether this workforce is expected to be drawn from the existing population or from in-migrant population.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The distribution of staff has been identified based on MSOAs within a 30km radius of the site which covers an approximate 45 minutes' drive which is consistent with the social-economic chapter. This is outlined in Section 5.2 in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	The proposed omission of the assessment of driver delay is not agreed. Statements such as 'it is not anticipated that the delay at Elms Road T-junction will be significant' have not been evidenced.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Driver delay has been assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Traffic surveys were not initially undertaken due to Covid-19 and travel restrictions. As the restrictions have eased and traffic levels have returned to normal, speed surveys have been undertaken during September and October 2021 to verify the data and to further inform the assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Further clarification is needed over the potential for and number of Abnormal Indivisible Loads that are expected to be generated by the proposed development.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided further details on the expected movement of Abnormal Indivisible Loads to be created by the development as part of its DCO application. These are included in Table 2-1 in Section 2.3 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Transport and Access	Consideration should be given to the baseline characteristics and the existing level of fear and intimidation based on existing flows. LA112 could be used to do this. The method for assessing change is considered to be reasonable, albeit that consideration needs to be given to those locations where impacts could easily change from one level of significance to another based on small changes in impacts.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of assessment of fear and intimidation is in Section 13.4 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] as submitted in relation to the Institute of Environmental Assessment, (1994). 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic'. IEA, Horncastle. This is recognised assessment methodology for EIAs It was agreed with the LPA in meeting post-Stat Con that this assessment methodology would be retained. LLA112 has not been used within the assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Limited evidence base is submitted to support claims about the number of operational staff that is being assessed. It is expected that relevant controls and monitoring is in place to ensure that the development does not exceed those figures.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided additional details of its expected numbers of operational staff in Section 13.8 within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is proposing a number of controls and a monitoring process for staff numbers on site, the details of which are included in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan and Travel Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport and Access	Paragraphs 13.6.45 and 13.8.17 of the PEIR claim to demonstrate that there are no road safety concerns. This is not agreed. The analysis of links is very subjective and does not consider frequency of use or length of link. Nor are thresholds given to indicate what level of collision rate is considered to constitute an issue. Detailed analysis of causation has not been undertaken. The impact of construction traffic on future collision rates has not been discussed in the PEIR. When assessing links as done at Table 3-10, it is useful to report this in number of incidents per km per miles travelled to then allow assessment against national data.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The road safety section in 13.6 within the Environmental Statement has been updated where possible [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This includes frequency of incidents per year and length of link as outlined in Section 13.6 within the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The councils would not agree that the data presented in the Transport Assessment (3.63 and 3.68) does not show incidents frequently occurring at any particular location. Specifically, there is a cluster at the A14/A142 junction proposed for use for access to the sites. This concern has been raised in past planning applications. At this stage the promoter has not commented on the influence of construction traffic on road safety.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The road safety Section in 13.6 within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) have been updated where possible. This includes frequency of incidents per year, length of link and causation as outlined in Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 within the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It is noted that causation is not provided for all incidents and therefore the analysis of causation has been undertaken where available.
Transport and Access	However, it is not accepted, as proposed within the assessment, that a change in traffic flows is considered to be reduced from major adverse to minor adverse purely because it brings those traffic flows closer to peak hour flows, without any indication for what this means for users of the network. It may be that significant severance occurs during the peak hour and simply bringing another hour to this level of severance and assuming that this is not considered to be an impact, is not considered to be acceptable.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Since the PEI Report, further analysis has been undertaken regarding the forecast change in traffic flows with details of the development peak hour flows and the highway peak hour flows are now provided within Section 13.8 in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement. Management measures are provided within the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	It would be helpful if the method of assessment included a tabular format highlighting the proportional change in traffic flows on each link, the sensitivity of each link and then compare these to the outlined criteria that are being assessed. It is not clear how the impact of vehicle flow changes on links is affecting their categorisation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided a tabular format within Section 13.8 within chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Transport and Access	Within the application the councils would expect to see more details regarding the access arrangements (swept path analysis, visibility, access widths and layout) to show that they can be used safely by the proposed construction traffic. For example, access to the temporary car park east of Elms Road will require a significant number of light vehicles to execute a right-hand turn into the site against local and other construction traffic.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has submitted additional details regarding site access arrangements as part of its DCO application including swept path analysis, visibility splays and indicative junction layouts as well as traffic management during the construction phase. This information can be found in the Framework Construction Management Plan and Travel Plan in Section 5 and Annex C (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and the Rights of Way and Access Plans [EN010106/APP/2.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	It is not accepted that changes in flows have a minor adverse impact purely because there are not walking and cycling facilities. Further understanding of users of the network would be needed to reach any conclusion.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken further assessment of the Scheme's likely transport impacts following the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in sections 13.6 and 13.8 within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement regarding link sensitivity and change in traffic flows.
Transport and Access	No evidence is submitted to support the arrival and departure profiles for HGV movements.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has submitted additional information in support of the anticipated arrival and departure patterns of HGVs from the Scheme sites as part of its DCO application. Further information regarding HGV management can be found in Section 6 of the Framework Construction Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Often the change in flows is not considered to be significant as it occurs outside of the peak hours; however, no evidence is submitted to conclude that this would be the case, and so any conclusions drawn on this basis are not considered acceptable.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken further assessment of the Scheme's likely transport impacts following the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in sections 13.6 and 13.8 within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement regarding link sensitivity and change in traffic flows. No staff are forecast to arrive or depart the Scheme within the network peak hours. This measure is included within the Framework CTMP, provided in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport and Access	There appears to be very little consideration of the impact of vehicles on cyclists, with most impacts dismissed due to the absence of pedestrian infrastructure.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details can be found in sections 13.4 and 13.8 of Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] regarding non-motorised users (NMUs).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	No assessment of decommissioning has been undertaken.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The impact of decommissioning has not been considered within this assessment given that it will be 40 years, with a minimum of 20 years for some elements, post consent. Traffic flows, advances in transport and removal of equipment will have altered such that it is not possible to predict the change at this stage. It was agreed with the Suffolk, Cambridgeshire and Highways England highway authorities that this would not be considered. As part of the DEMP a commitment is made to produce a decommissioning CTMP and TP document.
Transport and Access	We have raised concerns about the narrow width of many of the access roads e.g. Elms Road. The councils would consider that surveys of the widths are necessary to allow an evidenced position to be made about their suitability and the effectiveness of any proposed mitigation such as passing spaces or widening.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the proposed traffic management along Elms Road is provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]), including swept path analysis, visibility splays and indicative junction layouts as well as traffic management during the construction phase. Widening of Elms Road is being proposed to ensure it is of adequate width.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The promoter states that workers will work 12-hour shifts (3.6.13). The councils request further evidence that this is practical, particularly in winter, and what measures will be in place to monitor and control this behaviour. The promoter places much reliance on workers trips being outside typical peak travel times and failure of the shift system would result in transport impacts that will not be assessed in the ES.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided further information on the number of workers required on site and their anticipated shift patterns as part of the DCO application. Further information can be found in the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out in Section 6 management measures and Section 7 compliance and enforcement that would ensure that construction worker traffic movements are directed to hours outside of the network peaks. Compliance with the Framework Construction Management Plan and Travel Plan will be secured by a requirement of draft DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Within the DCO submission further evidence of the size and operation of the temporary construction car parks should be provided as evidence they are suitable for their proposed purpose.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided additional detail of the temporary construction car parks in the Section 6 of the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.
Transport and Access	Evidence will need to be provided to demonstrate the Applicant's assessment of the peak hour in paragraph 3.31 is accurate. If development traffic peaks are to be outside background peak times measures in the CTMP must embed this as a mitigation measure.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has assessed the Scheme's impact on traffic during the development peak hours and also referenced the highway peak hours as part of the Transport and Access Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out in Section 6 management measures and in Section 7 outlines compliance and enforcement that would ensure that construction worker traffic movements are directed to hours outside of the network peak. Compliance with the Framework Construction Management Plan and Travel

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Plan will be secured by a requirement of the DCO.
Transport and Access	The councils would seek greater comfort that HGV deliveries will be equally split across a 10-hour day as presumed in paragraph 6.14. Experience from other projects suggests that deliveries are focused in the morning.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application which details the number of HGV movements throughout the day. Section 6 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies management measures and outlines compliance and enforcement measures.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Speeds of vehicles through local communities has yet to be analysed in detail. As the Local Highways Authorities, we have been made aware of local communities concerns that speed limits are not observed by a significant number of drivers.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant recognises the importance that the local community places on road safety and is proposing safety protocols as part of its construction programme including directing staff to use the strategic highway network. This includes the A14, A11 and also the A142 to minimise the number of staff vehicles on the local roads. The vehicle routes are identified in Section 3 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan. These plans will be secured via a requirement.
Transport and Access	Consideration needs to be given to how the combined impacts of these topics interact; whether a number of minor adverse impacts would result in a moderate adverse impact in combination. This should include consideration of impacts on Public Rights of Way.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of cumulative assessment of transport impacts is provided within the Transport and Access Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Chapter 17 Effect Interactions of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the potential for several direct or indirect effects arising from the Scheme to give rise to an effect on a single receptor.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The method of assessment is not currently accepted. The councils seek supporting evidence to support the comments made in paragraph 5.3 that shifts will last for 12 hours particularly in winter months. It also notes that these shift patterns are generally incompatible with existing public transport timetables, particularly buses.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided further information on the number of workers required on site and their anticipated shift patterns as part of the DCO application together with a description of the measures that it would take in relation to construction worker traffic. Details can be found in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] Compliance with the Framework Construction Management Plan and Travel Plan will be secured by a requirement of draft DCO.
Transport and Access	Although the method of categorisation does not appear to be unreasonable, given the relatively small number of links being assessed, and that an absence of facilities does not necessarily mean an absence of users; the categorisation of each link should be agreed with the relevant highway authority.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities following the statutory consultation and has agreed the methodology for the Scheme's Transport Assessment through this engagement. Further information has been provided in Section 13.6 in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Table 3-2 in the PEIR sets out the peak traffic figures; however, HGV figures are set out as movements, whilst light vehicle figures are not clarified whether they are movements or vehicles.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Clarification provided within Table 6-1 in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	Confirmation is sought on the method used for factoring to the assessed development peak hours.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the factoring to assess the development peak hours are provided within Section 3.4 within the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Limited evidence is submitted to support the assessed number of HGV movements. Further details are sought on how the network peak hours have been determined and what controls and enforcement will be in place to ensure HGV movements do not use the local highway network during the peak hours and stick to the proposed routing. It is expected that some form of GPS or ANPR system is used, as set out in the construction management plan and that this is enshrined in an appropriate legal agreement.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has continued to engage with the host authorities following the statutory consultation. This has informed the methodology of the Applicant's Transport Assessment. The Applicant has submitted evidence in support of its assessment of HGV movements as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. To ensure that HGV movements relating to the Scheme follow approved routes and times, the Applicant is proposing measures set out in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Compliance with the Framework Construction Management Plan and Travel Plan will be secured by a requirement of the draft DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Paragraph 2.2.16 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) sets out a maximum number of HGV movements associated with the site. It is expected that monitoring and controls will be in place to ensure that these figures are not exceeded. This will be required to be enshrined through a relevant legal agreement within the DCO.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing a number of controls and a monitoring process for HGV movements, the details of which are included in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Compliance with the Framework Construction Management Plan and Travel Plan will be secured by a requirement of the draft DCO.
Transport and Access	Further clarification is needed over the potential for and number of Abnormal Indivisible Loads that are expected to be generated by the proposed development. Including by relevant categorisation as follows: • Category 1 • Category 2 • Category 3 • Special order movements It is understood that no AILs will travel to/from the site at present. Confirmation is sought that this is all AILs and not just special-order movements. As above, full details on all AILs should be provided. More details of the routeing and dimensions of AILs, including overhangs and swept path	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Available details regarding AILs including cranes are provided in Table 2-1 within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Further information regarding the crane route review can be found in Section 5 and Annex d of the Framework Construction traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	analysis at junctions and sharp bends should be provided with appropriate topographic details of the existing highway infrastructure. The LHAs is concerned that the trimming of hedges will not be enough to facilitate AIL movements safely within the constraints of the existing highway.			
Transport and Access	The Scheme makes no attempt to encourage or achieve staff travel by pedestrian, cycle and public transport. The sites are in reasonably close proximity to a number of built up areas, and although may not be considered to be within walking distance are likely to be accessible by cycle.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A mini-bus service will be used to transport staff around the site making use of internal routes where possible. Where the mini-bus is unable to use internal routes, the local highway network will be used to transport staff to the other site compounds. Considering the start/finish time of staff, any mini-bus service trips on the local highway network are expected to occur outside of the peak highway hours. Given the use of a mini-bus service the departure of staff is expected to be staggered outside of the highway peak hours and will be dictated on when staff return to the main two car parking areas. Once staff origin locations are known investigation will be made into providing a

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				mini-bus service to local residential areas to pick up/drop off staff who live locally as outlined in Section 6.2 of the in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2])
Transport and Access	It seems reasonable to assume that buses and mini buses could be used to move reasonable numbers of staff. A minibus should also be provided to/from the nearest railway stations to create the potential for longer distance journeys to be undertaken sustainably.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the mini-bus trips are provided within the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and Section 6.2 within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	It is expected that there will be a commitment in a travel plan to achieve the assessed 1.5 persons per vehicle car share, with relevant enforcement and monitoring. It is suggested that this is done by monitoring the total vehicle movements arriving and departing each access. A Travel Plan must be submitted as part of the DCO and relevant commitments made with the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing initiatives to reduce traffic movement and encourage vehicle sharing with details provided within Section 6.4 while compliance and enforcement measures are within Section 7 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan Report (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	Further information will be needed on the staff parking permit system and how this will be enforced.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided details of a parking permit system in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) compliance with which will be secured by way of a requirement to the draft DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Aside from applying a generic car share factor, no consideration is given within the Construction Traffic Management Plan to minimising staff vehicle movements on the local highway network. It is expected that consideration be given to facilitating: • Staff cycle movements to/from site. • Potential bus/minibus pick up/drop off from key employment locations • Potential bus/minibus pick up/drop off from relevant public transport hubs.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of measures to further reduce the numbers of construction worker vehicle movements are provided within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) including investigating the provision of a mini-bus service to local residential areas and railway stations. Compliance with the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan would be secured by way of a requirement to the DCO.
Transport and Access	No details have been provided to show which access points will also be used as crossing points between work areas. The same level of detail will be required for these crossing points, as for the main access points off the public highway. This is necessary as different methods of traffic management may be required to make this manoeuvre safe.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the site accesses is provided within Section 5 and Annex C of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This includes traffic management, swept path analysis, visibility splays and indicative junction layouts.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Highway condition surveys should be undertaken before, during and after construction work that will include the construction traffic route from the strategic road network to the various development sites. The survey should include main carriageway surfaces, footways, verges, and any adjoining access points. Any areas identified to be in poor condition, especially those near to residential properties, should be improved prior to the commencement of the development. During construction routes should be monitored and remedial works undertaken where necessary.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	As outlined in Section 6.2 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The roads that would be subject to such surveys will be discussed with the local highway authorities before the beginning of the examination, if it is accepted, with a view to reaching agreement before the examination closes. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will be secured by way of a requirement to the DCO.
Transport and Access	Details should be provided on how HGV traffic will be managed in the event of an incident; including communication with contractors and the potential for rerouting movements to/from the site.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details are provided within sections 5 and 6 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) in relation to HGV routes and management of HGVs.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Confirmation is required that minibus trips are included in the trip assessment or scoped out by not using the local highway network.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the mini-bus trips are provided within Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement as well as sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	Paragraph 3.3.4 of the Transport Assessment identifies that it was agreed at scoping that the traffic flows within the Forest Heath District Council Site Allocation Cumulative Impact Study would be utilised. The document was actually highlighted to draw attention to capacity issues that have already been identified in the area – it was not agreed that these traffic flows could form a sufficient baseline dataset. Therefore there are limitations for this assessment which should be discussed with SCC. SCC do recognise the current limitations on the availability of data; however, for clarity, absence of data is not considered a reason for absence of assessment.	Suffolk County Council	No	Additional historic traffic data sources have been identified and have been presented during consultation with the local highway authorities. This is in addition to that presented during statutory consultation. Further details of the historic traffic data sources used in contained within Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	The Applicant sets out that the use of certain traffic sources and the methodology used was agreed with Suffolk County Council (SCC), which is said to be identified in the scoping opinion. SCC are not aware of agreeing this methodology, and on reviewing the scoping opinion the response on traffic data sets out that we “would expect to be consulted on the scope of the baseline traffic collection”; this was in response to paragraph 13.6.2 of the scoping report that set out that “the extent of the traffic data and scope of any traffic surveys that may be required will be agreed with the County Highway Authorities, as statutory consultees, where possible”. It is somewhat disconcerting that these limited statements would be taken as acquiescence of the method identified. Therefore, we would state that the methodology has not been agreed, but we are happy to work with the promoter to come to agreement on a reasonable method especially given current limitations and recognise that some of the methodology may be considered reasonable following further discussions.	Suffolk County Council	No	Additional data historic traffic data sources have been identified and have been presented during consultation with the local highway authorities. This is in addition to that presented during statutory consultation. Further details of the historic traffic data sources used in contained within Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Further detail is needed over the assessment method use for factoring to the assessed development peak hours, albeit noting above our concerns regarding the use of these hours for the assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the factoring to assess the development peak hours are provided within Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment. (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	The method for assessing traffic growth is acceptable assuming that confirmation is obtained from the relevant planning authorities over any specific developments that should be considered as committed within the traffic assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided an assessment of predicted traffic growth in the area around the Scheme as part of its DCO application. Details of this assessment are provided in Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Confirmation is sought on the method used for factoring to the assessed development peak hours.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the factoring to assess the development peak hours are provided within Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	Further discussion is needed over the HGV numbers set out at Appendix G of the PEIR, it is understood that the busiest months are months 3 and 4 where there are 793 total HGVs, equating to on average 40 HGV movements per day. Further detail is needed on: • the determination of these numbers • the potential that other activities that have not started in Month 3 and 4 (such as Panels) could be going with this work still ongoing • the potential day to day variation in HGV numbers • What size of vehicles this includes (e.g. does it include LGVs)?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided further details about HGV numbers throughout the construction phase in Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and in Section 2 in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Paragraph 5.28 of the Transport Assessment sets out details on how the origin/destination of staff has been determined; further information is sought on this, as well as the estimated proportions from each MSOA.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Geographical Information Software (GIS) was used to determine any part of a Middle Super Output Areas (MSOA) are located within a 30km radius of the Order limits. Given the extent the area the MSOAs cover, this is approximately a 45 minutes' drive from the Scheme, which is consistent with the socio-economic Chapter 12 which applies a 45 minutes' travel study area. Details of the distribution of staff is provided within Section 5.2 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Transport and Access	The Transport Assessment sets out that the assessment of trips for the operational and decommissioning phase has not been undertaken, as agreed at scoping; further clarity is needed on this, as scoping comments suggest that the application should include the assessment of decommissioning.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A decommissioning Transport Assessment will be undertaken prior to decommissioning to assess the impacts of the decommissioning phase and ensure adequate mitigation is provided. The impact of the decommissioning stage is expected to be equal to or less than that presented for the construction phase as the number of HGVs and staff required during the decommissioning stage is expected to be equal or less. A Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan (DTMP) will be produced prior to decommissioning. This will be similar in structure and will contain similar measures to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				those set out in the CTMP produced to manage traffic. Appendix 13C: Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] details the mitigation measures required to reduce the impacts of increased traffic flows including HGVs on the roads and severance and intimidation associate with increased traffic and abnormal loads, which should be taken forward into the DTMP as a starting point and updated to reflect the circumstances prevailing during the period in which decommissioning is to be carried out. This measure is included with the Framework DEMP in Appendix 16D of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport and Access	Paragraph 6.9 of the Transport Assessment outlines the distribution of HGVs, whilst the absence of information on HGV origin is appreciated there are some concerns that it may result in an under assessment of impacts (particularly within the ES) on certain corridors. Further understanding of the potential implications of different splits in origins is sought. It is noted that the impacts on local roads are not included.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has provided information on the expected split within the origin of construction traffic related to the Scheme in Section 6.2 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	Further information is sought on Table 6-3 of the Transport Assessment where the 'base + construction movements HGV' movements at the B1085 should be reviewed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant notes this comment and has provided further information in Section 6 of the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Transport and Access	Justification of impacts is based on a comparison of traffic flows with those set out in the Forest Heath Local Plan; this is not currently accepted as a reasonable method without further understanding of the impacts and appropriate controls.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Additional historic traffic survey data has been obtained since the PEI Report which supersedes the majority of the traffic data used from the Forest Heath local Plan study. Further details regarding the historic traffic survey data are provided within Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment. The baseline traffic data now includes the following locations: Red Lodge Dumbbell Roundabout (North); Red Lodge Dumbbell Roundabout (South); B1506 Bury Road/Herringswell Road/Gazeley Road Junction;

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Dane Hill/turnpike Road Roundabout; B1102 Mildenhall Road/B1085 High Street/B1104 T-Junction; B1085 Chippenham Road/B1085 High Street/B1104 T-Junction; B1104 Station Road/B1102 T-Junction; B1102 Mildenhall Road/B1104 T-Junction; A142/Snailwell Road/Landwade Road Roundabout; and A14 J37.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport and Access	On reviewing the traffic flow changes at Appendix I, further understanding is needed on the impacts at the following junctions (depending on the absence of controls as well as other factors, this might include junction modelling), these include: • B1102/ B1085 junction • B1102 / Elms Road junction • A11 Slip / Elms Road • B1085 / Warren Road dumbbell roundabouts • B1085 / A11 slip roundabout • A14 / A142 junction • B1506 Station Road junction • B1506 / Herringswell Road junction • A14 / A11 junction	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has undertaken additional assessment on the likely impacts of traffic related to the Scheme on the following junctions: • B1102/ B1085 junction • B1102 / Elms Road junction • A11 Slip / Elms Road • B1085 / Warren Road dumbbell roundabouts • B1085 / A11 slip roundabout • A14 / A142 junction - B1506 Station Road junction • B1506 / Herringswell Road junction • A14 / A11 junction Further information is provided in sections 3.4, 5 and 6 of the Transport Assessment, Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment at these junctions is also constrained within Section 13.8 within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	There are concerns over noise from inverters, switchgear and other associated equipment disturbing equestrian users, for example on Bridleway 204/5. Such equipment needs to be located a sufficient distance away from PROW.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing to locate solar stations away from PROW. The proposed locations for solar stations can be found in the parameter plans included in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.3] and secured through the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2]. Further information is also provided in the Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. Inverters, switchgear and other equipment will be located away from PROW.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	The PEIR states "The DCO application will include a statement of statutory nuisance." It is unclear what such a statement will address.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN010106/APP/7.5] is submitted with the Applicant's DCO application in accordance with Regulation 5(2)(f) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended). This explains whether the Scheme engages one or more of the matters set out in section 79(1) (statutory nuisances and inspections therefor) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990(2), and how the Applicant proposes to mitigate or limit them.
Noise and vibration	The Application needs to address adverse amenity impacts and satisfy the aims of the Noise Policy Statement for England in that the development will mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on the quality of life, and not only be required to demonstrate the prevention of an unreasonable and substantial interference from noise and other nuisances.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operation. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect on human health and wellbeing are assessed in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], the assessment found potential negative impacts on the amenity of some residents on Weirs Drove and Hythe Lane in Burwell, Cambridgeshire during both

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the construction/decommissioning, and the operational phases. During the construction and decommissioning phase, this is due to noise impacts arising from the presence of HGV movements. During the operational phase, this is due to noise impacts arising from operation of the Burwell Substation Extension. There are expected to be no other negative health impacts on residents of properties or users of community resources in the study area. The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. Inverters, switchgear and other equipment will be located away from public rights of way. The Applicant has provided details of its proposed mitigation during the construction phase in the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN01016/APP/6.2]. Further details of how the Applicant proposes to address likely nuisance impacts on the local community are set out in the Statutory Nuisance Statement [EN010106/APP/7.5].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	The PEIR has not correctly addressed the variation between threshold daytime noise levels and the threshold levels at weekends, namely Saturdays after 1300 hours. Although the calculated range of predicted construction noise at all the receptors is calculated to be below a threshold level of 65dB(A) some are above the weekend threshold value of 55dB(A). Taking into account this issue the levels categorised as appropriate for describing the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) and the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) must be revisited as it is not a single threshold level of the noise that is to be considered but also the day of the week that construction is occurring and when elevated noise levels may occur.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during construction, which has defined LOAEL and SOAEL during weekdays (07:00-19:00), Saturday mornings (07:00-13:00) and Saturday afternoons (13:00-19:00). The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	Does the maximum period of 1 month for high construction noise levels at any of the receptors relate to levels below 65dB(A)?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during construction. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Construction noise levels are not predicted to exceed 65 dB LAeq at any receptors (ES Table 11-13) and any noticeable regular construction noise events (i.e. above existing ambient levels) are not expected to exceed 1 month.
Noise and vibration	Clarification required of the figures being quoted for sound power levels of the substations. Clarification is required on the difference in sound power of the transformers proposed on East A, West A and East B compared to that of the proposed extension to the existing Burwell Substation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Sound power levels for fixed plant are described in Chapter 11 and Appendix 11F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	It will be important when developing the detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to have regard to the rural nature of many of the dwellings in this area which are not adjacent to roads leading into or out of villages (therefore experiencing lower ambient levels) and to fully consider the adequate protection of their external amenity areas during construction phases.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has had regard to the rural nature of the dwellings in the area and has applied appropriate weighting to the existing baseline for likely disruption such as traffic and noise. The Applicant has provided Best Practicable Means (BPM) which will be applied during construction to minimise noise and vibration impacts resulting from the Scheme. These measures are detailed within the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and include a range of measures such as controlling noise at source, use of modern plant which is compliant with UK noise emission requirements and use of noise screens as required.
Noise and vibration	Concerns are often raised about breaches of acceptable standards and damage to property, so it is recommended that as part of the noise monitoring procedures to be adopted within the detailed Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and any S61 applications, that vibration monitors are also installed at key sites during specific periods, to enable reassurance to be provided to residents and the councils that guideline limits are being met.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	A construction noise and vibration monitoring scheme shall be developed and agreed with appropriate stakeholders prior to commencement of construction works as part of any Section 61 consent applications. The Section 61 application will be the mechanism for construction mitigation details to be agreed with the Local Authorities. The Applicant has provided details of its proposed mitigation and management measures in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted with the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	Information as to worst case noise levels should be provided.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the likely impact of the Scheme based on the best available information and is considered to represent a reasonable worst-case scenario. Further information is provided within Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 11D Construction Noise Modelling [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Appendix 11F Operational Noise Modelling [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Noise and vibration	The potential for low frequency hum from any of the proposed fixed plant is an issue that needs to be considered, and technical evidence provided in any final report if predictions show negligible adverse impact. Measurements of the existing Burwell substation did not identify distinguishable low frequency components from transformers already on site, but no data has been supplied to provide confidence that low frequency hum will not be an issue at any residential properties in the West Suffolk area	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Noise from the existing Burwell Substation was not audible above road traffic noise during daytime site visits at LT1 / R1. Analysis of the frequency spectrum data from LT1 (see Appendix 11C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) does not identify any tonal features in the local noise environment, during the day or night-time periods, which may have been attributed to the existing Burwell Substation. While the Burwell Substation Extension may result in an audible change to absolute levels of noise at the nearest receptors, it is not predicted that plant installations at the expansion would result in any noticeable changes to the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				character of existing noise environment in this area.
Noise and vibration	The assumptions made for the generation of the construction and operational noise models require further exploration and assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has provided additional information on its methodology for assessing the construction and operational noise impacts of the Scheme within Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Information relating to the development of construction and operational noise models are presented in Appendix 11D and 11F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	The Applicant should be providing confidence that the significance of operational noise impacts are sufficiently low that they will remain negligible under all weather conditions such as temperature inversions, positive downwind scenarios etc, and will not impact those properties who may experience lower background noise levels at night than those reported in the Baseline Noise Survey.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Calculations of sound propagation from plant has followed the methodologies from International Standards Organization (Part 1: 1993, Part 2: 1996) ISO 9613 – Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors. The calculation protocols include for downwind propagation conditions, and also hold, equivalently, for average propagation under a well-developed moderate ground- based temperature inversion, such as commonly occurs on clear, calm nights. As such they represent a reasonable worst case scenario of sound propagation. Information and assumption regarding operational noise modelling is presented in Appendix 11F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Mitigation and monitoring requirements are outlined within Appendix 16F OEMP, [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise and vibration	Clarification is required as to the noise levels being quoted are for externally sited transformers or internal ones housed in solar stations. If solar stations are to be used to house all the equipment, how will they be cooled and what noise impacts would result from cooling units serving these?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Information regarding proposed plant installations is provided within chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Assumed sound power levels for plant are presented in Appendix 11E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The manufacturer has advised noise emission levels of 79 dB(A) at 1m for both external and internal solar station plant designs. Therefore the noise assessment has considered both design options. Details of the operational noise modelling assumptions are set out in Appendix 11E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. However, ES para. 11.9.3 advises that "At detailed design stage the Applicant will check that the noise impacts at receptors are not more significant than has been demonstrated in the ES"; as the development of the Scheme is progressed the rating level of noise emissions (which will include any acoustic character corrections for tonal/impulsive/intermittent features per BS4142 guidance) will be designed such that no greater than a minor adverse effect at receptors (as concluded in ES Table 11-20), pursuant to the OEMP. The design will also consider the location of solar stations in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				accordance with the Works Plans, and any potential elevations in noise levels due to shifting the location of solar stations will be offset through procuring equipment with lower (than modelled) sound power levels or through silencers and/or acoustic barriers on equipment.
Noise and vibration	There are concerns relating to the proposed extension to the Burwell National Grid substation: There appear to be inconsistencies in the rating noise level at R1 in the PEIR. The actual noise rating should be clarified. During the night, early morning, and late evening are considered the most sensitive periods for noise impacts, as persons are more likely to be at home, enjoying their gardens during later summer evenings or resting. In any assessment of future noise impacts undertaking a BS4142 assessment on an industrial/commercial noise source and recording a +5dB difference between specific noise source and background levels could indicate complaints being likely.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	It is acknowledged in ES para.11.4.22 the guidance from BS4142:2014+A1:2019 that rating levels 5 dB above background levels are "likely to be an indication of an adverse impact, depending on the context" and a difference of 10dB is "likely to be an indication of a significant adverse impact, depending on the context." In turn, ES para. 11.4.24 defined the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) as a rating level equal to the background level and the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) as a rating level 10 dB above the background level. Predictions of operational plant noise (ES Table 11-17) identified that rating levels from

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	11.7.6 within the PEIR advises that the use of enclosures, local screening, silencers etc will be used as appropriate and should there be any such acoustic features present in the operational phases then a correction in accordance with BS4142 will be applied. This appears to contradict the earlier assertions. Any correction will increase the specific sound level and therefore the exceedance over background will increase. Such a scenario would therefore require further mitigation measures to be adopted to any currently anticipated. Our question is how is the operational noise, identified as a rated level of 34 in Table 11-20, described if it has no acoustic features? For example, is it a continuous drone, hum, buzzing sound etc and if so why is it not considered appropriate at this stage, for any correction factor to be added? The long-term spectrum results do not report on the third octave bands. Only octave band levels from 31.5 Hz to 8 kHz are tabled. Low frequency noise can often occur at 40 Hz and to identify if a low frequency component is present it is usually applicable to review the 10 Hz to 160 Hz range. In addition, the results of the 7 days monitoring period are produced as an octave			the Burwell Substation extension (35 dB LAr) may exceed night/early morning/late evening periods background levels (29 dB LA90) by 6 dB. It is acknowledged in ES para. 11.8.26 that this is equivalent to an excess of the LOAEL and the initial assessment is that this may result in potentially significant effect. As discussed in ES para. 11.4.23 and 11.8.28, BS4142 guidance advises that where background levels are low then the assessment of operational noise should take into context the absolute noise level, including consideration of internal noise affecting room occupants particularly during night-time hours. ES paras. 11.8.28-30 in turn conclude that plant noise break-in into bedrooms during the night/early morning/late evening would be below existing levels of ambient noise and considered to be not significant. ES para. 11.7.5 advised that “based on the proposed plant installations it is assumed that plant will be designed and selected to have no tonal, impulsive or intermittent features”. At the time of writing the ES and prior to selection/procurement of plant associated with the Burwell substation

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	band day and a night average over the whole period. Plots of third octave Leq,5 mins over different 24 hour periods would reveal a more detailed pattern and allow more confidence in any conclusions that existing transformers on this site had no tonal content to be considered for cumulative low frequency impacts from an extension to the site. The results that have been produced may suggest no tonal features, but I do not believe it fully addresses our original points of concern, that low frequency noise impacts from additional equipment must be fully considered and measures taken to mitigate any adverse impacts. Low frequency noise from transformers on large substation sites is an area of concern for many people living close to such sites. It is often reported that low frequency sounds vary in their audibility possibly during certain weather conditions or the number of transformers operating at any one time or the loading on the transformers themselves. Reports from persons affected by low frequency sounds generally suggest it can have a significant detrimental effect on their wellbeing. I do not consider the data to be sufficient at this time, to provide confidence that an expansion to the			extension no correction factors have been applied to the rating level of noise emissions. ES para. 11.9.3 advises that “At detailed design stage the Applicant will check that the noise impacts at receptors are not more significant than has been demonstrated in the ES”; as the development of the Burwell substation extension is progressed the rating level of noise emissions (which will include any acoustic character corrections for tonal/impulsive/intermittent features per BS4142 guidance) will be designed such that no greater than a minor adverse effect at receptors within Burwell (as concluded in ES para. 11.8.30). The design will also consider procuring equipment with lower (than modelled) sound power levels or through silencers and/or acoustic barriers on equipment, as necessary. While not expected during the time of writing the PEIR and ES, should the selected transformer equipment for the extension include low frequency sound components which may result in significant effects at surrounding receptors, then further mitigation such as dynamic vibration

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	transformers on this site will not have a cumulative effect on low frequency noise levels in the vicinity of the Burwell site.			absorbers and acoustic active cancelling will also be considered. Further analysis of the frequency spectrum data from LT1 (see Appendix 11C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which was used as representative of the noise environment at Burwell did not identify any tonal features in the local noise environment which may have been attributed to the existing Burwell Substation. The analysis in Appendix 11C considered the minimum, maximum, mean, 90th and 10th percentiles of the measured LAeq,15minute and LA90,15minute noise levels and their associated octave band data (16Hz to 16kHz) throughout the entire monitoring period. The analysis was separated out for daytime (07:00-23:00) and night-time (23:00-07:00) periods, with additional consideration for weekend daytime and night-time periods. Noise from the existing Burwell Substation was not audible above road traffic noise during daytime site visits at LT1 / R1. While the Burwell Substation Extension may result in an audible change to absolute levels of noise at the nearest receptors (i.e. during

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				night-time periods when the rating level of noise emissions exceeds the background level), it is not predicted that plant installations at the expansion would result in any noticeable changes to the character of existing noise environment in this area.
Ecology	The promoter should demonstrate that sufficient light will pass through the solar PV panel tables to support plant growth below.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant does not believe that light will pass through each PV module but in its experience, there will be sufficient ambient light to support plant growth beneath the modules. The project design will also include gaps between the PV modules to enable maintenance and support growth beneath the modules. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the OLEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is assumed that the overall loss of vegetation will be minimal. This should be firmed up and further information provided as to what will be impacted.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Scheme design intent is to minimise vegetation loss, as the existing vegetation framework provides initial softening to views and ecological value. This statement is included in the mitigation section of Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the OLEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Ecology	The Ecology chapter of the PEIR is lacking important details. Specifically, inadequate characterisation of impacts and unjustified exclusion of ecological features from detailed assessment. Detailed assessment fails to address all potential impacts and relies heavily on the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) for mitigation, which in themselves are lacking crucial details.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant considers that Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement provides a full and robust assessment, following CIEEM (2018) guidelines, of the potential impacts of the Scheme on important ecological features and that this is supported by a comprehensive Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement) and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Some of the habitats that will be lost require a big commitment to maintain them long-term and so we question the feasibility of re-creating them and would urge consideration be given to keeping and protecting what already exists, allowing existing land management regimes to continue in these areas.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Since the PEIR the Scheme design has evolved to avoid the majority of notable habitats. Where notable habitats are present within the Scheme measures have been embedded in the Scheme design, e.g. setbacks from existing features, such as woodland and hedgerows to protect and retain them throughout the duration of the Scheme life. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) sets out the framework for management regimes for retained and newly habitats.
Ecology	There has been insufficient adherence to the Mitigation Hierarchy, specifically with respect to the avoidance of important habitats and species. The scheme needs to be redesigned to avoid impacts on important habitats and species.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Since PEIR the Scheme design has evolved in response to consultation comments, with further areas supporting notable habitats, e.g. existing grassland areas in Sunnica East Site B being removed from developable areas. The Scheme has been designed in accordance with the Mitigation Hierarchy, avoiding important habitats and species, where practicable. This is reflected in the assessment presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], which concludes no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. This is also demonstrated in the avoidance of designated ecological sites

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				within Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Ecology	Given the importance of The Brecks and the ecological interests found within them West Suffolk Council expected that specific reference to Natural England and the RSPB would be more frequent within the PEIR. The absence of such reference casts doubts over the involvement of these organisations in the development of the Scheme and it is expected that the ES will address this.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Natural England and the RSPB have been provided with opportunity to comment on the PEIR during statutory consultation. Following receipt of comments on the PEIR further engagement on the Scheme was given during a workshop in March 2021 and through Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service (DAS), to specifically address their concerns on Stone Curlew.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Habitat creation proposals are lacking details, such as how they link to form a coherent nature network and their long-term management regimes.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Details of the habitat creation proposals and their long term management have developed since the PEIR and are presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Ecology	There is a lack of any information regarding the decommissioning phase and how this will impact on newly created habitats and their long-term survival. A stronger, clearer vision for the site should be provided for the post decommissioned stage.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has provided the Appendix 16E Framework DEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which sets out how the decommissioning process will take place. The Applicant is committed to returning the land use to its existing use post decommissioning stage.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Opportunities exist to deliver enhancements and benefits, should the scheme be delivered, and these should be explored much further at this early stage in the process and incorporated into the final submitted scheme.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Opportunities to deliver multiple enhancements have been explored throughout the design phase. A number of areas within the Order limits have been set aside for native grassland, hedgerow and tree planting which will lead to an overall enhancement in the amount of habitat within the Order limits. These areas are shown in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and the Parameter Plans.
Ecology	The whole area within Sunnica West Site A judged to be of County importance should be retained.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Assuming that this response refers to arable flora of county importance within Sunnica West Site A, areas specifically managed for arable flora, i.e. disturbed plots, have been accounted for in to the Scheme design, where appropriate. These are detailed in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Areas T7, T8, T9, T13 and T14 identified within the PEIR, Appendix 8B: Flora Report, which have been assessed as being of County importance for flora should be retained.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Areas T7, T8, T9 and T14 fall within the Order limits, as a result of changes in the Scheme layout as a result of Statutory Consultation T8 and T9 have been removed from the developable area and none of these four areas will be developed with any solar infrastructure. These areas will be retained and enhanced with native grassland planting. Part of T13 falls within E13 in Sunnica East Site B, shown in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3] and will be developed.
Ecology	Fields found to support nesting stone curlew should be retained alongside appropriate areas of connected foraging habitat.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The provision of offsetting habitat for Stone Curlew has been informed by the species distribution across the Scheme. Surveys undertaken by AECOM have shown that the nesting distribution of Stone Curlew is determined by the crop types present in any given year. The Scheme has embedded approximately 108ha of land for creation of Stone Curlew nesting and foraging habitat, in areas currently in arable farming. These areas are shown on the parameter plans, figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The area marked E23 within the parameter plans should be removed from solar development. This is to avoid loss of county important acid grassland.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The area marked E23 in the parameter plans has been removed from the developable area following consultation with various consultees and advice from ecologists. This area will now form part of the ecological mitigation area ECO3, which will be planted with native grassland. ECO3 is shown in Parameter plan Figure 3-1, included within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Further details as to the establishment of stone curlew plots are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Ecology	The external boundaries of the Scheme should include wider set-backs. We suggest 20 metres rather than 5 metres.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The setbacks are discussed in the OLEMP in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The general principle of the setbacks for the Scheme are as follows: Internal boundaries - <5m subject to other environmental constraints External boundaries with roads, settlement and PROW - >20m Where development lies on either side of a road / PROW, wider setbacks are provided.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Undeveloped mitigation areas for habitat creation should be designed to deliver a coherent and connected network of habitats, specifically designed to deliver for biodiversity.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The undeveloped areas where habitat creation will be undertaken form a coherent and connected network of habitats, which deliver for biodiversity. These areas are shown on the parameter plans Figures 3-1 and 3-2, of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3] and will be secured through the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan has been provided in Appendix 10I of Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Ecology	Further details should be provided of the specific types of habitat that are being proposed by the Applicant.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Details of the specific habitat types are provided in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Appropriate mitigation should be provided for skylark, including the provision of replacement habitat offsite if it cannot be retained on site.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	292ha of the Scheme will remain undeveloped and grassland habitats created. These areas will mitigate for the loss of breeding sites in arable farmland used by Skylark. The creation of grasslands in the developed areas when provide extensive foraging habitat for Skylark, which will benefit not only Skylark within the Scheme, but also Skylark breeding on land adjacent to the Scheme. The location of ecological mitigation areas and areas of grassland creation are shown on the parameter plans figures 3-1 and 3-2 and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Ecology	The Scheme could serve to improve connectivity between Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Meadows. This can only be considered to be a positive gain if the enhancements are committed to on a long term basis.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The scheme has embedded undeveloped buffers of retained habitat along the River Snail to maintain connectivity between Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Meadows. A further 26ha of current arable farmland will be turned to grassland to increase the area of semi-natural habitats present between Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Meadows. Details are provided in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and these

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				sites will be managed for the lifetime of the Scheme.
Ecology	Targeted enhancements could be provided to turtle dove habitats in the area.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Scheme will encourage the growth of existing hedgerows and allow natural regeneration of field margins in areas between existing boundary features and security fencing. The creation of bare ground plots for arable flora will also encourage seed-bearing annuals which are an important food resource for Turtle Doves. Details are provided in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Reference is made within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to improving watercourses associated with the Order Area. Commitment to such initiatives could benefit a variety of species.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The specific improvement of watercourses within the Scheme has not been taken forward into the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). However, the riparian margins will be seeded with a tussocky grassland and the watercourses will benefit from the ceased use of agricultural pesticides and herbicides. It can, therefore, be expected that the quality of watercourses will improve naturally through the duration of the Scheme life.
Ecology	The undeveloped mitigation areas appear to be providing replacement habitat for a very large array and diversity of displaced species and there is no clarity regarding the carrying capacity of these habitats and whether they realistically can deliver for all taxa affected.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Scheme has been designed to avoid important ecological features, but where this has not been possible, particularly for species associated with arable field centres, the Scheme has embedded land to mitigate for this habitat loss. The creation of biodiverse grasslands will support any displaced species and increase overall diversity. Mitigation proposed will be of sufficient capacity for any protected species affected taking into consideration species requirements and locations within which they exist. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plant (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement) provides further

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				information on mitigation measures and enhancements.
Ecology	This Scheme would represent an opportunity to lead on UK-based research into the operational impacts of solar farms on wildlife. The potential impacts on varying taxa may be adverse, beneficial or neutral, but any additional research to build on current understanding would be beneficial.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant would be willing to discuss this with interested parties.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The approach presented in the preliminary impact assessment in the Ecology chapter currently does not follow CIEEM (2018) standards for the following reasons: The assessment should aim to characterise ecological impacts: extent, magnitude, duration and frequency. All these should be quantified where possible. Durations should be expressed in months / years. Use of the phrases 'short term' and 'temporary' are used throughout the assessment and are never quantified or explained in the context of what that means for the specific ecological features being assessed. Insufficient detail is given regarding the mitigation measures and/or compensatory habitat, upon which the conclusions of the impact assessment are hinged. Insufficient regard is given to the cumulative impacts.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has followed the CIEEM (2018) standards, characterising the ecological impacts and providing quantified (including temporal) information where possible and available. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement and the OLEMP (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement) provide information on mitigation measures and enhancements.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Poor's Fen, including Fenland SAC, Chippenham Fen Ramsar / NNR, Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Poor's Fen SSSI. The Ecology chapter of the PEIR does not make reference to any published research regarding the potential for operational impacts on the adjacent European Site.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides an assessment of the operational impacts on European Sites and SSSIs and takes account of relevant research in doing so.
Ecology	Havacre Meadows and Deal Nook County Wildlife Site (CWS). The Ecology chapter of the PEIR states that the installation of required infrastructure will be done via tunnelling underneath the CWS. Does the promoter have any previous experience or examples where this has been successfully done? In the absence of such previous experience, how will the promoter plan for unforeseen problems that may occur? This receptor should be taken forward for more detailed assessment to consider all possible impacts on the CWS.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A suitably qualified and experienced contractor will undertake all construction works. All construction activities will adhere to the measures set out in the Framework CEMP. Measures to mitigate impacts on Havacre Meadows and Deal Nook CWS will utilise well established techniques which can be relied upon to avoid impacts.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Worlington Heath CWS and Badlington Lane CWS. These are within the DCO boundary and it is stated that these will be retained and protected, however, the Landscape Masterplan / Parameter plans show these areas as under native grassland planting. This receptor should be taken forward for more detailed assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Worlington Heath County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Badlington Lane CWS will not be subject to native grassland planting. The parameter plans, figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] have been updated since the PEIR to make it clear that these sites are retained habitats and not subject to planting.
Ecology	Joans's Meadow CWS and Worlington Golf Course CWS are on the DCO boundary and Landscape Masterplan / Parameter plans show potential provision of permissive routes around these. Where is the assessment regarding the potential for recreational disturbance due to increased walkers around these sites? This receptor should be taken forward for more detailed assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	No access will be allowed into either Joan's Meadow CWS or Worlington Golf Course CWS from new permissive paths. Therefore, any new recreational disturbance is not predicted as walking around the CWS is not anticipated to result in an effect.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Ecology chapter does not make reference to any published research regarding the potential for operational impacts on relevant receptors, 'Aquatic Macro-invertebrates'.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the potential for operational impacts on aquatic macro-invertebrates and considered all relevant research in doing so.
Ecology	Permanent loss of arable habitat (and some temporary loss of hedgerows) would appear to inevitably result in some effects on the wintering birds that have been found to use the site. As well as a direct loss of habitat, there could be impacts from noise during construction. Whether or not these are significant is not clear, but this receptor should not be excluded from further assessment, in order to provide clarity.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Chapter 8 of the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the potential for construction related disturbance to wintering birds and effects on wintering birds as a result of any permanent or temporary habitat loss.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The ecology chapter of the PEIR states that 'there will be no loss of important habitats used by bats anywhere in the DCO site'. By 'important' does this mean the habitats scored as 'high' in the Bat Report (Appendix 8G of the PEIR)? It's not clear how the statement links directly to the data collected in the field surveys and query why there are maps highlighting areas of most (and least) value for potential bat roosts, but not for commuting and foraging habitat. This needs further exploration. Use of thresholds for defining levels of bat activity must be used with care due to differences in the detectability of species and query whether such thresholds should be tailored for individual species/groups of species to take account of this.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The statement made in the PEIR refers to habitats which are important to bats, i.e. woodlands, hedgerows, wetland areas. These areas will be retained and protected as part of the Scheme, with enhancements embedded to strengthen their value to bats, e.g. additional planting of hedgerows and tree belts and grassland offsets. Details are presented in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Ecology chapter says that there will be direct loss of acid grassland and that this will result in a temporary short-term impact. There is no qualification as to what is meant by 'short term'. Impacts need to be characterised and quantified wherever possible. On what basis are the impacts in acid grassland considered to be temporary? This is not discussed. This comment extends to marshy grassland and semi-improved calcareous.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	There will be disturbance and temporary loss to 0.8 ha of semi-improved acid grassland during construction of the modules, this loss will be during construction only as the Scheme has included 30.9ha of dry acid grassland as part of its embedded mitigation. This, along with impacts on marshy grassland, are discussed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Areas of semi-improved calcareous grassland are no longer within the Order limits and will not be impacted by the Scheme.
Ecology	Has an analysis of soils been undertaken to demonstrate there are suitable areas available to create habitats of the same quality as those being destroyed? There are no details/commitment to how they will be managed long-term. Taking all this into account, it is unclear how the conclusion of 'temporary' impacts can be justified, or that the effects from the project will not be adverse or significant.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The creation of new habitats is based on the habitat communities currently present across the Scheme and recorded during the Applicant's extensive surveys. These surveys have been used to inform the creation of appropriate habitats. Details are presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan sets out how they will be managed (Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Within the PEIR there is no quantification of the areas of arable habitat to be lost and there is no detail as to how much is being lost as a percentage of the total existing on the site nor how much will be restored/created in compensation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Scheme will not be retaining any arable habitat within the Order Limits and no arable habitats are to be restored or created in compensation. The creation of grassland habitats will compensate for the loss of arable fields currently used by specific ecological receptors, and chapter 8 gives details of the numbers and percentages involved. Details are presented in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Ecology	When will compensatory habitat be of sufficient floristic diversity or suitable habitat structure such that it can support the invertebrate species and assemblages recorded on the site?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Grassland creation will take between 3-5 years to fully establish and achieve its biodiversity potential before management to improve and maintain biodiversity value can be achieved. However, it is anticipated that before such habitats are fully established that areas will be of benefit to and support terrestrial invertebrates. The predominant habitat to be lost by the Scheme is arable farmland (cropped areas), which is of low value to terrestrial invertebrates. Existing areas of habitat within the DCO Order Limits which support notable terrestrial invertebrates, e.g. natural and semi-natural grasslands, woodlands and hedgerows, will be retained.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	No details are supplied within the LEMP as to how marshy grassland habitats will be created.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Details of the creation of marshy grassland are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Ecology	How do the areas of habitat proposed link up to provide connectivity? Whilst compensatory habitat is developing, can the species affected survive on remaining areas of habitat? And if so, where are these areas and how big are they? Otherwise, there is a risk of species being lost permanently from the area, even if the habitat loss is temporary.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Scheme will be constructed in zones throughout the 24-month construction period. Therefore, the entire Scheme will not be under construction at the same time and there will be 'zones' of construction activity. Wildlife temporarily displaced from these construction zones during earthworks and other construction activities will have sufficient areas of habitat remaining in the vicinity during these periods. 292ha of the DCO Order Limits will remain undeveloped and will be planted with native grassland, linear hedgerows and trees. Existing features such as natural and semi-natural grasslands, woodlands and hedgerows will be retained. The retained and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				planted hedgerows and trees will continue to provide connectivity across the Scheme and habitat during construction, operation and decommissioning. Further detail is provided in the OLEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Ecology	How has the level of disturbance in the stone curlew mitigation areas been assessed? Disturbance to nesting stone curlew could result from the operational maintenance activities or from areas of replacement habitat being provided close to roads or well-used footpaths, including proposed permissive paths.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Stone Curlew offsetting areas have been embedded within the Scheme in locations which minimise risk of disturbance during construction. Some operational maintenance activities will be subject to seasonal restrictions, where there is potential for disturbance to Stone Curlew. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents an assessment of operational impacts on Stone Curlew.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The proposals for acid grassland creation would appear to aim to deliver a suitable habitat structure for stone curlew but no quantification is provided as to how much of the undeveloped mitigation areas will be acid grassland, as opposed to semi-improved grassland which would likely have a denser sward. Therefore, despite the figures looking suitable, much of the newly creation grassland may need to be discounted from the calculations as it may not provide suitable breeding habitat.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A maximum of ten 2ha Stone Curlew nesting plots will be delivered in areas ECO1, ECO2 and ECO3 in parameter plans figures 3-1 and 3-2, included within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. These will provide areas of bare ground or short sward suitable for both nesting and foraging Stone Curlew. At least 30.9ha of acid grassland creation/reversion from current arable farmland will be provided in ECO3. Details as to their establishment are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Ecology	Insufficient information is provided regarding the specifics of the three stone curlew plots, so it is not possible to understand their suitability in terms of distance from sources of disturbance, linkage to suitable foraging habitat, how they will be managed long-term to retain suitability.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A maximum of ten 2ha Stone Curlew plots are to be provided across areas ECO1, ECO2 and ECO3 in parameter plans figures 3-1 and 3-2, included within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. These plots will provide both nesting and foraging habitat and are set in areas amounting to approximately 108ha of grassland creation and reversion to semi-natural grassland from arable. Details as to their establishment are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Stone curlew can be slow to return to breeding areas after displacement and so how will the construction disturbance affect the overall stability and size of the wider stone curlew population?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The location of Stone Curlew offsetting areas has been embedded within the Scheme in locations which utilise areas of the existing distribution of Stone Curlew to minimise the risk of displacement. No construction activities will take place within 500m of Stone Curlew nesting locations. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents an assessment of construction impacts on Stone Curlew where it is considered that the Scheme will not affect the overall stability and size of the wider Stone Curlew population.
Ecology	Research has demonstrated stone curlews travelling up to 5km from nest sites during breeding and observations of colour-ringed birds shows movement of stone curlews between the development site and the Breckland SPA. This demonstrates a link between Breckland SPA and habitats over a greater distance than the previously defined 3km buffer, to the extent that they may have an important role in maintaining or restoring the population of stone curlew at favourable conservation status. we would dispute the findings of impacts on stone curlew. We would therefore dispute the impacts on stone curlew as being temporary and not	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this recent research and accepts that the Stone Curlew population associated with the Scheme are functionally linked to Breckland SPA population. This is reflected in the Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment Appendix 8M of the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	significant. This should also prompt a revisiting of the Stage 1 HRA Screening report. If deemed to result in 'likely significant effects' on stone curlew, these will need to be considered within the Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment.			
Ecology	The timing of when the replacement/compensatory habitats will be available for breeding birds is not given. There is no discussion regarding how temporary the loss will be and how the bird species affected will fare in the intervening period.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The timings of creation of habitats required for mitigation are set out in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The DCO will provide that the mitigation plots must be in place before the Scheme works which affect the existing plots can commence.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There is no discussion relating to potential operational impacts on breeding birds, with no reference to any published literature which discusses how birds may be affected by solar panels or examples of successful breeding bird habitat created between panel arrays. Is there evidence that species such as skylark will nest under solar panels at the density proposed at this site?	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Potential operational impacts on breeding birds are presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and consider relevant research and literature in determining effect pathways. This assessment includes the impact on ground nesting birds of 'open countryside', e.g. Skylark.
Heritage	Within the PEIR, paragraph 7.4.1 refers to the study area as being 1km which extends to 5km for higher grade assets. There does not appear to be any explanation for this, and the setting of Grade II listed buildings is protected in the same way as the higher-grade buildings.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The differentiation between study areas for the grades of listed buildings reflects the NPPF which ascribes higher value to Grade I and II* listed buildings and Scheduled monuments. The rationale has been expanded upon in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Table 7.17 – Sunnica East B refers to views to the north of the Freckenham Conservation Area potentially being affected. This is more likely to be in views to the east. Sunnica West A also refers to the same view from Freckenham being affected. It is assumed that this is included in error.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has reviewed the text in relation to Freckenham. The amendments can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Chippenham Park is remarkably coherent, both visually and topographically, for a designed landscape and has a strong, distinctive presence within its surrounding area. It is very important locally and the report's own definition of medium change still acknowledges that this constitutes a 'noticeably different change to setting affecting significance, resulting in erosion in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.' That is in plain terms a harm.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The assessment of Chippenham Park ascribes significance in accordance with the integrity of the parkland and its relative significance, including nationally. It does not rely on designation alone and it is acknowledged that Chippenham Park represents a good survival. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] notes the potential to harm the park and its setting. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] specifically considers the question of harm; as opposed to 'likely significant effects' which are assessed in the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The impact is most acute where the south drive extends beyond the perimeter of the park proper, as this effectively bisects West Site A. There is no indication on the 1:17500 scale figures of how closely W04 and W05 will encroach upon the drive, but clearly the wider the buffer the more effect it is likely to have. It should also be noted that even if the scheme proposes to restore planting along the drive, it cannot itself constitute screening: an avenue by definition is a sequence of trees at regular intervals and depends upon space for its effect. Further information will be required on these points to demonstrate that the conflicts have been mitigated as far as possible.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design in this area and is incorporating greater setbacks with a new planting regime along the avenue at parcels W04 and W05 (figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). The planting has taken into consideration the original design of the Avenue to achieve a balance between screening and restoration. These designs have been formulated in consultation with landscape specialists and ecologists. These are shown on the Parameter plans and secured through the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Heritage	The site contains areas of high archaeological potential, and it is necessary for the Applicant to provide sufficient trial trenching coverage to ensure that impacts on below-ground heritage assets can be mitigated by detailed design.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The scope and extent of the trial trench evaluation works has been agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Mitigation requirements cannot be defined without full evaluation. There needs to be a commitment to undertake archaeological mitigation- either preservation in situ or full excavation-across the entire development area and factor that possibility into project programmes, given that the extent of the archaeological resource is currently unknown and the worst-case scenario approach.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation of all accessible areas has been carried out across the scheme. The scope and extent of the trial trench evaluation works has been agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC. Mitigation measures (including avoidance and proposals for further archaeological fieldwork) are set out within Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and have been agreed formally via an overarching methodology document (WSI or similar) prior to the beginning of any programme of trenching works. Moving forward post consent, the Applicant has committed to the preparation of a Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (DAMS) document, which will set out the mitigation works (both in terms of archaeological fieldwork and preservation in-situ). This will be prepared following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC, and in line with a mitigation brief issued by them.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	It is essential that the outstanding areas circa 74.6ha in Zone B and 19.4ha in Zone C, 113ha of land on the cable route or in the 10ha required for HV connections, which leaves a total of 217ha to revisit (plus any additional elements of the scheme which have since been added into the red line boundary) are surveyed. This work should be undertaken as a priority at the earliest opportunity- before DCO submission- given that they include high archaeological potential areas, in key sections which have limited flexibility. It is presumed that this work will be submitted as part of the Environmental Statement, but it would be preferable for the Councils to see the preliminary results as soon as they are available.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	In areas where geophysical survey was not possible, an enhanced sample of trial trenching has been carried out. The scope and extent of the trial trench evaluation works has been agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	If the Applicant wishes to undertake an 'avoidance' mitigation approach to below ground heritage where possible, it cannot finalise the design without having fully defined all the surviving below ground heritage assets which will be impacted upon by different elements of the Scheme.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Results of geophysical survey works and the subsequent trial trench evaluation have allowed avoidance measures (preservation in-situ) to be carried out where notable concentrations of archaeology have been encountered. This strategy has been agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC. Upon completion of the pre-determination evaluation trenching works, the Applicant will proceed with the preparation of a Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (DAMS) document, which will set out the mitigation works (both in terms of archaeological fieldwork and preservation in-situ). This will be prepared following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC, and in line with a mitigation brief issued by them.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	There is a high potential for additional unknown archaeological remains to survive throughout the scheme red line boundary area which are of high significance, including a potential for human remains, funerary monuments and settlement. The geophysical survey undertaken to date is a considerable commitment and achievement, but it needs 'ground truthing', as part of a suite of techniques.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Following the geophysical survey works, a programme of trial trench evaluation has been carried out. The scope and extent of the trial trench evaluation works has been agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.
Heritage	It is strongly advised that all elements of the scheme should be subject to archaeological trial trench evaluation. The Environmental Statement should set out the approach to any outstanding archaeological evaluation which is required, alongside mitigation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The scope and extent of the trial trench evaluation works has been agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The Councils wish to highlight the severe risk to extremely tight project timetables by leaving the second phase of evaluation until post consent which means that archaeological mitigation requirements will not be able to be defined until this point. Delays are possible if extensive areas requiring archaeological mitigation are defined.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Noted. The majority of the trial trench evaluation works in the Sunnica East and West Sites have been completed, the results of which are provided in appendices 7C, 7D and 7E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The remaining areas of land that have not yet been subject to trial trenching are being surveyed in September and October post-harvest and the results will be submitted pre-examination, as explained in the Environmental Statement.
Heritage	Insufficient assessment has been undertaken to determine the full scope and significance of heritage assets and therefore the impacts of different elements of this scheme. Many of the statements presented in this chapter are assumptions based upon insufficient assessment to support these conclusions. Further detail needs to be provided on the potential for additional unknown remains.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Evaluation through geophysical survey has been carried out, and trial trench evaluation works, to characterise and date archaeological activity identified through the geophysical survey (along with testing the veracity of the results in "blank" areas) has been undertaken. The scope and extent of the works was agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for both SCC and CCC. The results of the geophysical and trial trenching surveys are presented within appendices 7F to 7I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], and assessments on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the basis of this works set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement.
Heritage	Significant portions of information related to Archaeology is out-of-date and does not reflect the discussions the Councils have had with the Applicant since the non-statutory consultation in 2019. Additional areas are now included in the Scheme red line boundary and these require assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	HER data searches were renewed in April 2021 following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The assessments relating to archaeological impact in the PEIR cannot be agreed with the councils unless the desk based assessments are updated and the assessments are made on the basis of the proposal as it stands. We encourage the Applicant to ensure the DCO proposals reflect and capture all discussions which have taken place to date.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Desk-based assessments have been updated (in line with consultation responses) for submission alongside the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	Archaeological matters, as well as being in the Written Scheme of Investigations (WSIs), should be considered in RAMS documents and Construction Environmental Management Plans, Materials Management Plans, Decommissioning Environmental Management Plans etc. Logistical considerations should be reflected throughout for instance: • Spoil management associated with archaeological work should be factored in; • Plant movement should be factored into traffic assessments; • Ecological implications of pre-construction archaeological work should be considered.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Archaeological matters relating to construction and decommissioning are detailed within the Framework CEMP and Framework DEMP in Appendix 16C and 16E respectively of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Discussions have taken place to seek to reduce or eliminate the stripping of easements by the use of ecogrid of a suitable grade that will enable vehicles to traverse the site alongside the cable, restricting stripping to a far narrower impact width than typically specified. Operating a new way of working will provide the Sunnica project with greater environmental credentials and will have the additional benefit of reducing the need for hundreds of evaluation trenches to check the geophysical survey results.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Discussions have taken place between AECOM's heritage team and the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC re. the approach for the archaeological stripping, mapping and recording of the cable route and associated easement. All comments re. easement width will be taken into consideration when finalising the methodology for the works (which would be carried out post-consent) and directional drilling techniques will be used to avoid the need for open cut trenching where practical. Geophysical surveys that have been undertaken over large proportions of the cable route have also allowed for avoidance measures to be employed where concentrations of archaeology have been encountered.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Insertion of the cable by drilling is considered for special sections of its route: road/rail/river/infrastructure crossings, but would provide greater benefits to archaeological landscapes if rolled out more extensively - the carbon cost of which would have to be modelled alongside that for traditional open cut cable laying in stripped working easements. Under current climate change agendas, all major construction schemes should have greater regard to this aspect of construction and reduce pollution from carbon emissions as far as possible.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Boring/moling/drilling has different impacts on archaeology that needed to be considered when choosing if it should replace conventional trenching; for example, it requires working areas either side of the boring/moling/drilling for the equipment and laydown that changes the footprint of the affected area. The construction GHG emissions have been assessed and are presented in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], with the Scheme having an overall major beneficial effect on Climate Change with the proposed construction methods i.e. a mix of boring/moling/drilling and traditional open trench. There are a number of considerations when determining the type of construction including physical, environmental, land take requirements, programme and cost constraints. The Applicant has considered all of these in the approach to the construction methodology along the cable corridor and has proposed a mix of intrusive and non-intrusive approaches.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The archaeology of Isleham is well known for its richness at fen edges and in the river valleys, where high water tables and relict peat soils and alluvium have aided the survival of organic remains and through intermittent preservation of old land surfaces and prehistoric occupation in the many undulations in the chalk 'upland' of the parish. Understanding these areas and their potential can only occur through physical, trench-based, evaluation.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Trial trench evaluation works have been carried out (including in proximity to Isleham) to establish archaeological potential (and characterise and date any activity encountered). The scope and extent of these works has been agreed with the archaeological services team for CCC.
Heritage	We agree with the areas selected for preservation and will continue to work with the Applicant to ensure that the land management strategies are appropriate for the conservation of these sites: both for the construction period and the lifetime of the Scheme.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	At Sunnica West Site B, our concerns surround the potential impact of perforating wetland deposits in which ancient organic archaeological remains might be preserved (in the floodplain/fen area) and in so doing risk their dewatering, degradation and loss of palaeoenvironmental and organic content. Evaluation trenches will be needed to assess the deposit sequences and palaeochannels surviving in this archaeologically sensitive area, as shown in the CHER records, to validate or dispel this concern, to determine whether development is suitable here and to refine the mitigation solutions for development and its scale in this location. Piled PV panel foundations can be replaced by concrete shoes where ground conditions and archaeological evidence dictates, but it is too soon to comment on the best approach to such strategies. This area, however, should be classed as highly sensitive until further, tangible evidence has been acquired.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant notes this. Trenching in these areas has been undertaken by an appropriate professional contractor, with the scope, extent and methodology of the works agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC. The results of these works are presented in appendices 7H and 7I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and will serve to establish the potential for encountering organic remains associated deposits. Where wetland deposits in which ancient organic archaeological remains might be preserved are encountered during the evaluation trenching works, the design has in-built flexibility for the deployment of avoidance measures in these areas, with the areas of archaeological activity being preserved in-situ. Where possible, the extents of proposed development in Sunnica West Site B have also been focused on areas of higher ground away from the river and its immediate floodplain, limiting the impact upon the ecological, archaeological and landscape resource.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Aerial photographic transcriptions have not taken place owing to the temporary closure of the national repository of aerial archives for archaeological research due to the Covid-19 pandemic.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	This remains the case, and it is unlikely that the situation with the Historic England archives will allow the aerial photograph segment of the works to be completed. This has been discussed and agreed with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.
Heritage	The geophysical survey technique suggested in the PEIR is not recommended for wetland areas, trenching will be required to be undertaken by professionals used to working in wetland areas, supported by geoarchaeological investigation and research.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Noted. Trenching has been undertaken by an appropriate professional contractor, with the scope, extent and methodology of the works agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Officers from Historic England do not assess trench locations for schemes setting out to evaluate non-designated archaeological evidence. This is a matter for local authority archaeology services.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The scope and extent of the trial trench evaluation works has been agreed following consultation with the archaeological services teams for SCC and CCC.
Heritage	Discrete findspots or metal detector finds can indicate the presence of underlying sites of interest and therefore the areas of such finds cannot be discounted from further assessment.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Noted. These have been discussed within the Historic Desk-Based Assessments (DBAs) in appendices 7C, 7D and 7E [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Whilst not assessed for direct impact due to their status as surface spreads of material (often no longer extant within their original context), the location of findspots and metal detector finds has been used to inform the assessment of archaeological potential within the Historic Desk-Based Assessments (DBA) baselines and also within Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. This information was also used to inform the placement of

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				trenches as part of the trial trench evaluation works.
Heritage	The subject sensitivity values given to some heritage assets do not always accord with the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record's opinion.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] details the assessment methodology and reasoning behind the sensitivity values given to heritage assets. The known archaeological resource for the site area has also been expanded following geophysical survey and trial trenching works, and as such some sensitivity values have been revised in light of information arising from the results of these works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	With regards to the Applicant's proposal to extend the Burwell National Grid Substation, it is unwise to predict that no archaeology will be present at a fen edge location. It is appropriate to consider the effect unknown until the completion of non-intrusive surveys (aerial photograph transcriptions, PAS data review) and physical evaluation had occurred.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	Evaluation works through geophysical survey have been undertaken to establish archaeological potential on Option 1 for the Burwell National Grid Substation Extension. For both Option 1 and 2, assessment of LiDAR imagery, HER records and PAS data has been reviewed and interpreted as part of the Historic Desk-Based Assessments (DBA) in Appendix 7E [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Geophysical Survey report which includes the results of the geophysical survey at Option 1 for Burwell National Grid Substation Extension is provided in Appendix 7G of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and discussed in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Any further investigations will be developed as part of the Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy to be developed in consultation with stakeholders.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Concerns are raised in relation to the treatment of topsoil and spoil from the sites. In terms of the soil as a natural resource, retaining the distinct ecological characteristics of the sites and to encourage local biodiversity back to the sites there needs to be a priority for topsoil management, retention and redistribution on site. Further reference to the management and maintenance of the sites post construction should be made and it is suggested reference is made to DEFRA's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites and that this tool is utilised- (weblink) The operational phase management should minimise fuel demands and avoid spraying, and this should be detailed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	An OLEMP is provided in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This outlines the management of soil and habitat during operation of the Scheme to manage and mitigate any potential environmental impacts.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Measures to reduce the noise impact should be applied, for example a commitment not to undertake the noisiest works prior to 0800 hours Mon-Sat, higher noise impact works to be completed by 1800 hours Mon-Fri and if working through to 1900 hours on Saturdays I would wish to see additional methods employed so that those tasks with the potential for higher noise impacts are adequately mitigated between 1300 and 1800 hours and are not undertaken after this time.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The noise assessment within Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], has been based on the core work hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday. However, the Applicant has provided Best Practicable Means (BPM) which will be applied during construction to minimise noise and vibration impacts resulting from the Scheme. These measures are detailed within the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2], and include a range of measures such as controlling noise at source, use of modern plant which is compliant with UK noise emission requirements and use of noise screens as required etc. The Section 61 application will be the mechanism for construction mitigation details to be agreed with the Local Authorities, including time for noisy works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Working hours are expected to be 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday. An assurance is required on these hours and that there will be no working on Sundays, bank holidays and public holidays.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Core working hours will be 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday. These hours are set out in the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Compliance with Framework CEMP would be secured by a requirement of the draft DCO.
Construction	The PEIR assumes construction plant such as push piling. Vibration distances are lower for push piling than other piling activities.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant has assessed the likely impact of the Scheme based on the best available information and is considered to represent a reasonable worst-case scenario. Where alternative piling methods such as auger piling may be used on other parts of the Site, BS5228-2 provides example vibration levels which are similar to that of push piling (advised in ES para. 11.8.12 as typically limited to 1mm/s PPV at distances of 10m); as such there would be no additional effects from construction works vibration above that presented in the ES. The Applicant is proposing a package of measures to mitigate construction phase noise and vibration impacts which can be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				found in the Framework CEMP which is Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Noise and vibration mitigation measures are set out in Table 3-6 of Appendix 16C and includes measures relevant to piling. These include: ensuring that, where reasonably practicable, noise and vibration is controlled at source (e.g. the selection of inherently quiet plant and low vibration equipment); review of the construction programme and methodology to consider quieter methods; consideration of the location of equipment on-site and control of working hours; and when piling, use of lower noise piling where reasonably practical.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	We highlight the importance of recording the actions taken to resolve any justifiable concerns received about noise and/or dust deposits. Such a log can positively influence future work methods and controls moving forward into later stages of the construction.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant is proposing a package of measures to mitigate construction phase noise, vibration and dust impacts as part of its Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan which is Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] has a complaints protocol to deal with complaints arising for the project. This states: the Environmental Site Officer will be the focal point for the Scheme. The complaint will be recorded in the Complaints log at which point the complaint will be investigated. If a complaint is found to be valid, immediate action will be taken (where appropriate and practical) to address the problem. The necessary preventative action will be taken to ensure conformance to the CEMP. When a complaint has been investigated and the appropriate action has been initiated, the complainant, where contact details are available, will be informed by letter of the outcome within 48 hours. In closing out any complaint, all relevant documentation associated with the complaint will be filed in the Complaints Log. Any complaints will be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				reported by the Project Manager in the monthly progress report.
Construction	Concern is raised about why flood lighting is required, when other solar farms have demonstrated they can secure the site with infrared lights during the operational stage of the development.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant will have lighting to secure the sensitive areas of the site during operation. These will be focused inwards on the substation and BESS areas only. The lighting provided within the Site will be motion sensors and therefore, under usual operating procedure there will be no lighting within the site. Further details of this can be found within Chapter 3 - Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	It is understood that the construction programme will be 24 months; further information is sought as to whether this has impacted on any conclusions based on the 'temporary' nature of construction activities and whether an extended programme would affect these conclusions.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] outlines the proposed construction timeframe. The proposed programme is 24 months; however, there is a potential for the programme to extend or to be phased. Each technical chapter (Chapter 6 to 16) provides an assessment of the worst-case which is typically 24 months; however, where this is not the worst case, this is acknowledged in the chapter and a worst-case assessment is presented.
Construction	The assessment of construction effects on the published landscape character assessments relies on the fact that the effects are focused on only a small part of each of the landscape character areas. Whilst the GLVIA allows for the geographical extent of the effects to be part of the consideration, in this assessment, significant weight is given to the fact that the effects would only be on small and localised in relation to the	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The assessment considers a range of factors, including the extent of the construction activity in relation to the wider geographic area of the published landscape assessments. This is required under GLVIA 3, as acknowledged by the question and demonstrates the physical change is localised. The assessment also includes consideration of the nonphysical impacts, e.g. perception.

Topic area	Consultation response		Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	wider extent of the published landscape character area.				
Construction	Given the scale of the proposed Scheme, the use of the Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) is not suitable for the construction phase. We would expect that such a development will seek to ensure it meets environmental management best practice in terms of target setting, on site management, monitoring and reporting as well of off-site reporting to key stakeholders. In terms of demonstrating Best Practice, the Councils would expect a stated objective to	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No		A Framework CEMP has been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Specific reporting measures as informed by the findings of the ES are captured in this document. The Scheme has a range of embedded mitigation measures which will contribute ensuring the scheme is sustainable and will contribute to the UKs net-zero target. However, the Scheme is not required to carry out a CEEQUAL assessment and the Applicant has considered that the embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme ensure a highly sustainable Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	achieve an Excellent or higher CEEQUAL rating.			
Construction	In relation to construction, the Councils' main concerns are related to fuel use on site; in relation to vehicle journeys to and from site; waste volume arising, and recycling rate set out. This project should be setting an exemplary approach to waste management and recycling and this should be made clear as a target to be achieved.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A Construction Resource Management Plan (CRMP) as set out in the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] will be prepared for the Scheme at detailed design stage. Fuel usage and waste management procedures for the Scheme and approach are set out in the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The councils would like to see targets for fuel, waste, water and energy consumption reduction for the construction and operation phase alongside a reporting mechanism as to how progress against these targets is being achieved.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	A CRMP will be prepared for the Scheme at detailed design stage. This document will set out targets for fuel, waste, water and energy consumption during the construction and operational phase and a reporting mechanism. This requirement will be set out in the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Construction	With regard to contaminated land, we are in general agreement that the risks have been appropriately identified and that it would be appropriate to undertake the intrusive investigations following consent (should consent be granted) to assess the identified risks.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has noted this response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The CEMP in its current form does not make a specific commitment not to illuminate important bat flight lines, foraging habitat or potential roosts, nor other habitats that may be of importance for other nocturnal wildlife. Given that the Ecology chapter of the PEIR relies on the CEMP for its conclusion of 'no significant effects on bats', the CEMP contains insufficient detail to allow such a conclusion to be made. The CEMP states in relation to lighting 'controls on lighting/illumination to minimise...potential adverse effects on...bats will be considered as far as is reasonably practicable'. We would expect that important / potentially important bat habitat, in all its forms would be identified and highlighted as areas to be kept dark during both construction and during the operational phase of the solar	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	A Framework CEMP and a Framework OEMP have been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16C and 16F respectively of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These plans include commitments on lighting. During construction, the use of lighting will be minimised to that required for safe site operations, lighting will utilise directional fittings to minimise outward light spill and glare (e.g. via the use of light hoods/cowls which direct light below the horizontal plane, preferably at an angle greater than 20° from horizontal) and lighting will be directed towards the middle of the construction site rather than towards the boundaries. During operation, the use of motion detection security lighting to avoid permanent lighting will be utilised and a sensitive lighting scheme will be developed ensuring inward distribution of light and avoiding light spill on to existing boundary features. Specific areas to be kept dark during construction and operation are not provided within these documents at this stage, and these details would be highlighted within the full CEMP and OEMP following detailed design and prior to the construction and operation phases respectively. Details regarding the location of important bat flight lines, foraging habitat or potential roosts is provided in Appendix 8J of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	farm. If this is not possible, then the Ecology chapter needs to identify and highlight that there is potential for significant adverse effects on bats, providing an adequate level of detail so that it is understood how the various species of bats will be affected by the different phases of the Scheme.			
Construction	Given the unspecific nature of the reduction measures set out in the CEMP, we would expect the effects of noise disturbance, in particular on birds, to be more fully explored within the Ecology chapter of the PEIR.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The effects of noise disturbance during construction on relevant bird receptors is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement which is Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A Framework CEMP has also been submitted with the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement which is Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response		Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The assumptions include that the excavated material from the cable route and other excavation will be stored within the DCO site. However, it is not clear where this will be stored, and how it will be accommodated both in the short term and during operation. This has the potential to contribute to the landscape effects of the proposal.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No		The Applicant does not consider that the excavated material will contribute towards the landscape effects of the Sunnica Energy Farm, as material will only be temporarily stored within the site and then utilised to backfill trenches. Details as to how the excavated material from the cable route and other excavation will be stored in the short term and during operation can be found within the 16C Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan and the 16F Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan both of which are Appendices of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Construction	There does not appear to be any provision for de-compacting the soil after use of heavy machinery during construction and prior to mitigative seeding/planting.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes		The Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the DCO Application includes consideration of de-compacting soil after use of heavy machinery.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	As an approach, the reliance on a CEMP to rule out an assessment of impacts within an EclA would not appear to follow best practise; a CEMP is not an integral part of the design of the development.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Framework CEMP sets out mitigation measures during construction which are well established, follow relevant guidelines and ensure compliance with legislation. These measures are sufficiently well defined that they can be relied upon for compliance and therefore to form an integral part of the Scheme design and delivery. A Framework CEMP has been submitted with the DCO Application (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement) which is Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Operations	Further clarity as to the perimeter fence should be provided. It appears that the BESS, substations and other infrastructure such as the solar stations would require more substantial security fencing and it is not clear whether this has been taken into account in the PEIR.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant takes the issue of security seriously and has considered this within its proposal. More details as to the types of perimeter fencing to be provided around each type of infrastructure can be found within Chapter 3 - Scheme Description [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In terms of security normally the perimeter fencing of the plant is sufficient as this has CCTV and only qualified personnel can enter in the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. However, the substations normally have other specific fencing, and this is identified in the indicative layout plans and cross sections. Regarding the solar stations, only the outdoor transformer needs a specific fence, the inverters and the switchgear doesn't need it. The BESS compound can also have security fencing around it similar to that for the solar

Topic area	Consultation response		Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
					stations and the onsite substations. This will need to take into account fire safety.
Operations	Clarity is also required on where the weather stations be positioned and what form will these take.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No		The Applicant has provided more details as to the location and form of the weather stations. The maximum dimensions of the weather stations be found within Chapter 3 - Scheme Description [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The maximum number of weather stations will be 136 and they will be located near the solar stations.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Have the 'Increased summer and winter temperatures' been taken into account in relation to the impact on the Solar cell performance	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	The Applicant has used historical data for modelling future performance of the PV modules. Details of the production at the start and end of the operational lifetime of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found in the Chapter 6 - Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant estimates that climate change effects will likely result in increased production and that therefore these estimates are conservative.
Operations	We would like to see a commitment to grazing, as this seems the only solution to create and maintain the conditions required by the majority of the various grassland habitat types.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	The Applicant believes that grazing is an important tool to manage the grassland habitats. The Applicant has set out its approach to grazing within the OLEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the Environmental Statement. After the initial seeding and management period (3 or 4 years after seeding) as set out in the OLEMP, grassland is intended to be subject to general or conservation grazing (intensity pulse grazing using sheep).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	It is envisaged that rotavating the ground / use of other mowing machinery will be unlikely to be carried out due to the potential for debris/stones to kick up and damage the solar panels. The time involved in tracking such machinery in and around the lines of panel arrays would also seem to make it unlikely to happen in reality. Therefore, in the case of arable flora, we cannot see how suitable habitats can be created and maintained within a solar farm. Ground disturbance is key to maintaining favourable conditions for these plant species and no demonstration of a feasible approach to long term habitat management has been provided.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Large stones would be removed prior to the implementation of the new grass. Maintenance can be undertaken with small machines and with the modules set up above the ground, we consider the potential for damage to the modules is negated. The Applicant has set out its approach to grazing within the OLEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the Environmental Statement. After the initial seeding and management period (3 or 4 years after seeding) as set out in the OEMP, grassland within conservation grazing areas should be managed through low intensity pulse grazing using sheep.

Topic area	Consultation response		Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The PEIR proposes a Construction Resource Management Plan (CRMP) to form part of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to deal with the management of waste. Suffolk County Council, as the waste planning authority for Suffolk, consider that this is an acceptable approach and does not expect the quantities of waste to warrant objection. The Councils would appreciate sight of the relevant management plans in advance of submission as the framework CEMP deals with waste very briefly.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No		A Framework CEMP has been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which includes the requirement for the CRMP. The appointed contractor will provide a detailed CEMP and the CRMP prior to construction for approval by the relevant planning authorities. The framework management plans will be submitted with the DCO Application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Details of the decommissioning process are required prior to the submission of the DCO application and it should be demonstrated how this process will be financed and managed.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	No	Details of the decommissioning process can be found within Appendix 16E Framework DEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has provided details of how it intends to fund the Scheme during the construction, operations and decommissioning phases in the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2].
Decommissioning	The amount of waste requiring managed disposal following decommissioning is substantial. Reusing or recycling old panels would be required before material is disposed through landfill. While the PEIR refers to the possibility of components being recycled it is unclear on current and likely future techniques and whether these would be more costs effective than disposal.	West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This requires the preparation of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP) in advance of decommissioning which will set out how recycling and waste disposal will be managed at the decommissioning stage. The DRMP will provide further detail on techniques and specific facilities which will be required in advance of the decommissioning stage. It is not possible to accurately predict these details at this point given that decommissioning is proposed for no earlier than 2065.

Appendix J-3: Regard had to comments from consultees under s47 of PA 2008

Table J-3.1 below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s47 of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with sections 6.3 and 6.5 of the **Consultation Report [EN010106/5.1]**.

Table J-3.1: Regard had to comments from consultees under s47 of PA 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	A road-side site would be better and have less of an impact on both the environment and local villages and hamlets.	NO	Sunnica East Site A and Sunnica West Site A are in close proximity to the strategic highway network. The effects on the local road network are assessed within Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Use industrial sites instead.	NO	Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land such as industrial sites when selecting the land for the Scheme. This is discussed in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] The assessment concludes that previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within a 15km search area for the Scheme.
Site selection	Put your panels on industrial buildings such as supermarkets and factories.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			(NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its Development Consent Order (DCO) application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely. There is a need for large scale solar generation to meet national renewable energy targets. The need for large scale energy generation is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land for site selection purposes which is discussed in the Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Site selection	Most schemes of this size are in deserts.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	There are huge areas of heathland and scrub further away which is of no use agriculturally.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Based on the assessments, the majority of land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].
Site selection	There are thousands of acres of similar land well away from villages.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Solar PV should be installed on domestic rooftops.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely. Within section 9.3 of the Statement of Need, the Applicant sets out the importance of scale in solar development. This is because it brings greater decarbonisation and economic benefits when compared to a number of smaller, independent schemes comprising an equivalent generating capacity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	I feel it should be compulsory on all new builds and not taking up valuable precious land.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely.
Site selection	This should be along railways instead.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar and is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Use brownfield sites instead.	NO	Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land (brownfield land) when selecting the land for the Scheme. This is discussed in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment concludes that previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the 15km search area for the Scheme.
Site selection	Use areas closer to Cambridge.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	The Solar Trade Association states that there are 617,000 acres of south-facing commercial rooftops that are not yet being utilised in the UK for solar power. This could provide 50% of the UK's electricity need.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely. Within section 9.3 of the Statement of Need, the Applicant sets out the importance of scale in solar development. This is because it brings greater decarbonisation and economic benefits when compared to a number of smaller, independent schemes comprising an equivalent generating capacity.
Site selection	Supermarket or airport car park shelters are a more appropriate location for PV modules.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely. Within section 9.3 of the Statement of Need, the Applicant sets out the importance of scale in solar development. This is because it brings greater decarbonisation and economic benefits when compared to a number of smaller, independent schemes comprising an equivalent generating capacity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	Use land above Fordham moor.	NO	This land has been considered as part of the Alternative Sites Assessment (see Appendix 4A of the ES, Table 3-1 [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This explains that the majority of this land is Grade 2 Agricultural land with some areas of Grade 1 and Grade 3 land. This land would not therefore be identified as unconstrained land as part of assessment process, due to being best and most versatile agricultural land.
Site selection	We have not been shown the alternative sites that you say you assessed, why not?	NO	The alternatives chapter of the PEI Report presented an overview of the methodology for site selection and the key reasons for selecting land for the Scheme. The information presented for statutory consultation was our preliminary environmental information which was appropriate for the statutory consultation. Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides the detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme.
Site selection	There is plenty of space away from residents between Red Lodge and A14-Cambridge.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Instead, Sunnica should pay for every roof in East Anglia to be covered with solar panels.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant has provided a

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely. Within section 9.3 of the Statement of Need, the Applicant sets out the importance of scale in solar development. This is because it brings greater decarbonisation and economic benefits when compared to a number of smaller, independent schemes comprising an equivalent generating capacity.
Site selection	The edge of the villages should be used for solar. No one would build there for 30 years and after the initial build there would be no agricultural traffic.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2], which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Perhaps you could move the project a few miles down the road and use some of Thetford Forest.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Makes insufficient use of land close to a major trunk road that	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to smaller solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	would be more suitable for a smaller scale solar farm.		Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	A smaller scale development along the A11 and A14 and using the former landfill site east of the A11 would be more appropriate with less impact.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to smaller solar developments but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. Within section 9.3 of the Statement of Need, the Applicant sets out the importance of scale in solar development. This is because it brings greater decarbonisation and economic benefits when compared to a number of smaller, independent schemes comprising an equivalent generating capacity.
Site selection	I am sure the Scheme could be reconfigured for the same acreage but differently distributed N&S of the A11. Please	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	demonstrate this comparison in your business model to NSIP.		[EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. This land has been considered as part of the Alternative Sites Assessment (see Appendix 4A of the ES, Table 3-1 [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Site selection	There is little evidence that alternative methods of providing the same levels of renewable energy or alternative, more sustainable, locations have been looked at meaningfully by the applicant.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to other renewable energy technologies but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. It also considers alternative technologies. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	E24/25/ E26/27/28/29 could be sited further from Worlington Village towards the A11, in the immediate field south and east of those numbered, adjacent to existing solar arrays perhaps or spread the site over the other	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. An updated description is provided within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting to the north, east and south of parcels E24 and E25 to screen the solar structures. Hedgerow and woodland planting has been incorporated adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views to the north of parcels E30-

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	side of the A11 in the fields towards Park Farm.		32. The PV modules within parcels E26-29 have been offset from boundary vegetation to retain the landscape pattern and screen the PV modules from wider views. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located on Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will move the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from Worlington. The consultees response makes reference to parcel numbers referenced in the parameter plans presented in the statutory consultation. Those parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents the landscape and visual impact assessment. Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP).
Site selection	What other areas of the UK have you surveyed to allow an assessment to take place? I believe it is fundamental and socially responsible to have considered alternatives.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Why isn't it closer to a substation which has the necessary capacity for a Scheme this size?	NO	The Applicant has made more than 100 applications to connect at different points in the region. Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] includes the reasons for selecting the Burwell National Grid Substation and the area of search from this connection point. It also explains how suitable land within the area of search has been identified. The latter includes the process of excluding various planning and environmental constraints including best and most versatile agricultural land which is the characteristic of the land closer to Burwell National Grid Substation.
Site selection	Developers should build project in their own backyard.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Put them on non-food producing land such as heathland e.g. The Elvin Estate.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. It is not clear where the Elvin Estate is

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			located following searches for this location and has not therefore been able to be considered in the Alternative Sites Assessment (see Appendix 4A, Table 3-1 [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This shows that the Applicant has sought to avoid best and most versatile agricultural land as far as possible when considering alternatives to the Scheme location.
Site selection	Put West Site A along the A11 up to La Hogue road.	NO	A significant portion of Sunnica West Site A is located along the A11 and up to La Hogue Road. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	The Scheme should be moved to the Fens.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. The Fens is designated as a Ramsar site, Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area, European Marine Site, Site of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserve and Local Nature Reserve and therefore has been excluded as land suitable for the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	This should be in a non-populated area.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including avoiding residential areas.
Site selection	Take it to another country not here.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Site selection	This Scheme should be sited on the land between Fordham and Burwell to reduce the need to lay extensive cabling across so many acres of land.	NO	Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] includes the reasons for selecting the Burwell National Grid Substation and the area of search from this connection point. It also explains how suitable land within the area of search has been identified. The latter includes the process of excluding various planning and environmental constraints including best and most versatile agricultural land which is the characteristic of the land between Fordham and Burwell.
Site selection	The land surrounding Burwell is better in terms of topography and is equal quality to that at Sunnica West Site A.	NO	Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] includes the reasons for selecting the Burwell National Grid Substation and the area of search from this connection point. It also explains how suitable land within the area of search has been identified. The latter includes the process of excluding various planning and environmental constraints including best and most versatile agricultural land which is the characteristic of the land closer to Burwell National Grid Substation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	The Scheme should be nearer to towns and cities where it will be needed not in rural areas.	NO	Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] includes the reasons for selecting the Burwell National Grid Substation and the area of search from this connection point. It also explains how suitable land within the area of search has been identified.
Site selection	You only need to drive to Norwich to see large areas of open country well away from settlements where, if solar energy is really important and economic and the impact on wildlife can be justified, a solar farm might be sited.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	The Scheme should not be placed on sensitive and scarce peat fenland.	NO	The Scheme will not be located on peat fenland. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Site selection	I would be in favour of a limited development in the area, similar to others nearby and closer to the A14 where the visual and environmental impact is lessened.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including landscape and visual impact.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Development of larger projects of this scale is preferable to developing a number of smaller solar projects. This is because larger projects bring carbon savings and economic benefits when compared to a number of smaller, independent projects that match the generating capacity of a single large project. Further information can be found in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Site selection	I will be proud to be living in the vicinity of this scheme.	NO	Thank you for your comments.
Site selection	No one in their right mind would want this to go ahead and on their doorstep.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. The Applicant has undertaken a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to assess the impact of its proposals. The results of these assessments are published in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Within the ES, Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2] includes the reasons for selecting the Burwell National Grid Substation and the area of search from this connection point. It also explains how suitable land within the area of search has been identified. The latter includes the process of excluding various planning and environmental constraints including best and most versatile agricultural land which is the characteristic of the land closer to Burwell National Grid Substation.
Site selection	I am supportive of the site location.	NO	Thank you for your comments.
Site selection	Go away we don't want you.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including avoiding residential areas.
Site selection	How was Sunnica allowed to purchase so much land unabated?	NO	To date, no land has been purchased. The Applicant has sought to enter voluntary agreements with landowners and only where voluntary agreement has not been possible is the Applicant seeking consent from the Secretary of State to be provided compulsory purchase powers. Further information can be found in the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1] and in the Book of Reference [EN010106/APP/4.3].
Site selection	The location of both Sunnica West A and B are not acceptable.	NO	The criteria used for site selection was published during the statutory consultation under Chapter 4: Alternatives of the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate.
Site selection	A Scheme of this size should not be built in a rural area.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. In choosing the site for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm, the Applicant considered a number of alternatives including brownfield sites. Further information can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Site selection	The loss of green belt land is unacceptable.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			[EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. This includes avoiding areas of green belt land within the area of search. The land identified for the Scheme is not within the green belt.
Site selection	The location of the Sunnica West sites are more preferable to the Sunnica East sites as they are proposed in more open areas.	NO	Both the West and East sites are to be taken forward as part of the Scheme. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. The need for large scale energy generation is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25).
Site selection	The area is ideal for solar PV, our own domestic solar panels exceeded PV predictions by 10%	NO	This comment is noted.
Site selection	A few years ago, we tried to get solar panels for our roof and no one was interested because we were in a conservation area.	NO	This comment is noted. The Scheme is not providing roof top solar installation and is instead a large-scale solar development using ground mounted PV modules.
Site selection	I disagree with the PEIR which states that the area is 'relatively sparsely populated.' This is an area of high growth pressure due its proximity to Cambridge	NO	The description is based on professional judgement and baseline data collected using publicly available sources and documents, which includes mid-year population estimates and annual population survey (sources are detailed under 12.12 References in Chapter 12: Socioeconomics and Land Use of the PEI Report). Forthcoming developments (unimplemented planning permissions and development

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	demonstrated by expansions of Red Lodge and Mildenhall.		allocations in the Local Plan) are set out and considered in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Site selection	It should be moved elsewhere away from people's properties.	NO	The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential dwellings. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including avoiding residential areas.
Site selection	Sunnica has only chosen this site as it is the path of least resistance, but it has the most adverse impact.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	There are already 20 installed or planned solar farms within a 15-mile radius.	NO	The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers existing solar farms in the baseline. Additionally, proposed solar farms have been considered in the cumulative assessment. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) which the Applicant is

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			bringing forward to meet the need for new sources of renewable energy. The Applicant has provided a Needs Assessment [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the project in the context of new renewable energy generation more widely.
Site selection	This area is doing its bit for renewable energy generation already.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement existing renewable energy projects in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The Applicant has provided a Needs Assessment [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the project in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely.
Site selection	We already provide 450 megawatts of solar energy in this area, and it is not reasonable or justified to expect a further 500+ megawatts from the same landscape.	NO	The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers existing solar farms in the baseline. Additionally, proposed solar farms have been considered in the cumulative assessment. The Applicant is of the view that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement existing renewable energy projects in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the project in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely.
Site selection	Sunnica West Site A is too close to Godolphin Training ground and will negatively impact welfare of riders and horses during construction.	NO	Godolphin have been engaged throughout the design process. It has been agreed that construction works will start no earlier than 10am in areas in close proximity to the Snailwell Gallops. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. This is outlined in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of potential disturbances such as noise, glint and glare, and vibration have been assessed as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The results of these assessments are presented in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant's assessments of noise have concluded that there will be no significant noise impact at receptor R4 Snailwell during both construction and operations. A Glint and Glare Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 16A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme design following this assessment, and no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme. The full results of these assessments are presented in chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects were identified on the receptors at Godolphin's training facilities.
Site selection	The Scheme should not be built on greenfield land.	NO	Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land as opposed to greenfield land when selecting the land for the Scheme. This is discussed in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment concludes that previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the search area for the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	The location is not suitable for an industrial development of the size proposed.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. Whilst it is understood that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm would constitute a different use to what is on the site now, the Applicant does not consider the impact of solar to be negative nor industrialising. In choosing the site for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm, the Applicant considered a number of alternatives including brownfield sites. Further information can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Solar farms are quiet neighbours that cause little disruption to the communities that live close by. The Applicant recognises that the local landscape is important and that many local people attach significant value to it. We are proposing extensive visual mitigation through offsets and planting. This will establish over time to soften and screen views into the site. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size.
Site selection	The Scheme is close to the major towns of Mildenhall, Newmarket and Burwell.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impact on settlements surrounding the development in the Environmental Statement. Assessment of landscape, noise, socio-economic, transport, air quality and human health impacts can be found in Chapters 10 to 15 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The assessments have found that while there are likely to be residual significant effects on landscape and visual receptors and users of Public Rights of Way during construction, there are no significant residual effects resulting from noise, socio-economics, transport, air quality and human health. The socio-economic assessment has determined that there will be significant beneficial effects on the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			local economy. Similarly, no residual significant effects are anticipated during operation for noise, socio-economics, transport, air quality and human health receptors. Significant effects are predicted for landscape and visual receptors at Year 5; however, only one residual significant effect is anticipated at Year 15 for Recreational users and users of the training grounds at the Limekilns (Visual Receptor Reference 38).
Site selection	The Scheme covers land used to grow crops to feed the Bay Farm anaerobic digester plant. This would contravene the original planning application and mean additional CO2 is produced.	NO	Where appropriate, the Bay Farm anaerobic digester was considered within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The operator of the Anaerobic Digestion Plant at Bay Farm has sought amendments from West Suffolk Council to their planning conditions which were approved in July 2019. These amendments allow the plant to make use of feedstock sourced from a wider geographical area beyond the areas E26, E27, E28, E29, E30, E31 and E32 that are included within the boundary of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Our proposals are not therefore expected to impact on the Plant's compliance with its existing planning conditions. The consultation responses were based on the parameter plans that were consulted upon at statutory consultation. Those parameter plans have been updated and are included in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. To assist consultees references to the parameter plans have been retained in this document.
Site selection	Sunnica West Site A is ideally located as it is sensible infrastructure location. It runs alongside the A11 trunk road, effectively combining two pieces of infrastructure.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	I guess you are building this here because don't want a fight with the colleges you are just trying to take the easy way.	NO	It is unclear to whom or what this comment refers. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Sunnica West Site B is appropriately located.	NO	This comment is noted.
Site selection	Sunnica West Site B should be developed from Snailwell Road towards the A12 roundabout where there is already significant industrialisation of the countryside.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	The battery storage units are too close to roads.	YES	Following feedback received during the statutory consultation, the Applicant has amended the placement of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) at Sunnica East Site A to set it further back from Ferry Lane. Further details can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The Applicant has considered the likely landscape and visual impacts of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm, including the BESS element in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which acknowledges that the BESS will result in

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			adverse visual effects once implemented. This has informed the Scheme design, with new areas of proposed tree planting around the BESS, so as to reduce the visual impact of the BESS. In addition, the colour tone of the BESS would be sympathetic to the colour tones of the landscape, so as to better integrate the BESS within the landscape. Further information can be found in Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Site selection	The location is inappropriate due to the amount of new proposed housing in the area.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area, which are included in each of the technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and summarised in Chapter 17 and demonstrate that the impacts from the Scheme are acceptable. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is appropriate for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.
Site selection	Whilst the visual impact of much of your proposal lies outside our neighbourhood we nonetheless request assurances that it will be considered holistically with the built and proposed solar farms on Burwell Fen itself.	NO	Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual receptors and sought to reduce the potential effects of the Scheme through embedded mitigation. Taking into account the feedback from the PEIR and the results of the specialist surveys and studies a suite of landscape mitigation measures and design changes have been proposed to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. This has included the removal of some areas previously

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			suggested for solar use; the addition of 'set back' areas from field edges closest to human receptors and the introduction of a large amount of tree and grassland planting. The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area in its cumulative assessment, which has been undertaken in each of the technical chapters of the ES and summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Appendix 5A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents the shortlist of cumulative schemes that have been considered in the cumulative assessment.
Site selection	We have already lost a lot of land in the area due to several housing developments.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area in its cumulative assessment, which has been undertaken in each of the technical chapters of the ES and summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES, Appendix 5A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents the shortlist of cumulative schemes that have been considered in the cumulative assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Site selection	Amenities and infrastructure are not evolving to support the growth of our villages.	NO	The Applicant considers that solar farms are quiet neighbours that cause little disruption to the communities that live close to them. The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed with Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment presented in Chapter 13 has concluded that there would be no significant adverse effects as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			In terms of amenity, the Applicant's assessment found that there are no community facilities or businesses that would likely experience a significant effect on their amenity during the construction or operation phases. These findings can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. They take into account the results of the air quality, noise, transport and visual assessments. In terms of recreational benefits, the Scheme proposes new permissive paths across Sunnica East Sites A and B. This is in contrast to the existing situation, as the Site is not publicly accessible.
Site selection	The area east of W15/W16 is to be obliterated with 500 houses Kennett Garden Village.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area, which is included in each of the technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and summarised in Chapter 17. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	Currently Isleham is expanding rapidly with several new housing estates being constructed. This increases the need to maintain infrastructure in the surrounding area, as well as preserving the rural character of the region.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area, which is included in each of the technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and summarised in chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction, including road maintenance. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction. In terms of preserving the rural character of the region, The Scheme has been designed to minimise the effect it will have on the countryside. This has included the removal of some areas previously suggested for solar use; the addition of 'set back' areas from field edges closest to human receptors and the introduction of a large amount of tree and grassland planting. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents the landscape and visual impact assessment. Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents the Outline LEMP. Figures 3-1 and 3-2

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			show the parameter plans for the Scheme, which shows the layout of the Scheme.
Site selection	Sections E11 and E23 are within 150m of houses, and this is far too close with minimum planned screening.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation and an updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This can be viewed within Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from Worlington. These changes will further set back from residential dwellings and improve screening of the Sites from receptors. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The East sites are too close to houses in Isleham.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A has been reduced in size. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure are now located further away from Isleham. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	The East sites are too close to houses in Worlington.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. This will set back the project sites further back from residential dwellings in Worlington. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. This sites the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure are now located further away from Isleham. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The panels are right up to the backs of people's houses.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. This will set the project sites further back from residential dwellings in Worlington. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. This sites the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from Isleham. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced. As a result, this will set back the project from residential dwellings in the area. The areas

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W14 is being set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Extensive treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate the impact on Kennett Garden Village. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	I object to solar panelling along both sides of Elms Road.	NO	The Applicant considers the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and has provided significant embedded mitigation. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Along Elms Road views will be softened to varying degrees from the commissioning of the development. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting which would range between 1m and 3.5m in height, in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height. As this planting establishes from day 1, the softening and screening of views will therefore increase and occur prior to year 15. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation which will further mitigate the visual impact of the proposed project. An updated description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This can be viewed at the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].
Site selection	The two south approaches to Chippenham will be impacted by overbearing solar panels and	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	associated security fencing which are too close to both the B1085 and La Hogue Road.		modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A has been reduced with no PV modules in proximity to the B1085 from Chippenham, via the removal of W13 and W14. The set back of the Scheme has been increased from La Hogue Road, with additional new planting, which in combination with the retention of the existing hedgerows will screen the PV modules.
Site selection	Sections E24,25,26 &28 are particularly close to village access routes.	YES	The Applicant has designed the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to take account of the potential impact on the landscape and is proposing significant embedded mitigation. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in the Outline LEMP submitted as Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the project to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting to the north and east of parcels E24 and E25 to screen the solar structures and additional hedgerow and woodland planting adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views for motorists and from views from the wider landscape to the north of parcels E30-32. The PV modules within parcels E26-29 have been offset from boundary vegetation to retain the landscape pattern and screen the PV modules from wider views. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The revised project design will also improve the visual impact on recreational routes in the Scheme's vicinity. Parcels E11 and E23 have been set back to improve the impact from the U6006, and proposed landscaping will enhance natural vegetation and screening along the route. Additional permissive routes will enhance the connectivity of the area to improve the relationships between villages. Further information can be found in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and land use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The Applicant has assessed the impact of transport as part of its environmental impact assessment. No significant impacts are anticipated on transport throughout the Scheme's lifetime, including on fear and intimidation as well as accidents and safety. A Transport Assessment has been included as Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. A Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) has been published as part of the DCO application, and contains further information regarding HGV management in Section 6 including HGV routing, which will be directed to use the Strategic Road Network and generally avoid using the local road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. All of the proposed accesses are suitable for their intended purposes. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	By building Sunnica West Site A so close to the school you are causing noise disruption which	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impact of noise and vibration as a result of the Scheme. Noise emitted from the Scheme is not anticipated to have a significant impact on any of the assessed receptors at any stage

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	denies children their rights to get a good education.		of its lifetime. This was detailed in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report and an assessment is included in Chapter 11 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Site selection	There are a number of solar farms within this area that are away from residential properties, much smaller in size and are profitable.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to other sources of renewable energy, but rather compliments them in helping the country meet its requirements for new forms of energy generation. The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application which sets out the need for a project off this size in the context of new renewable energy generation more widely. Regarding the proximity of the Scheme to residential properties, the Applicant has further revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. An updated description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This can be found within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. This will set back the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located from residential dwellings.
Site selection	You should avoid building within 500m of a village/town.	YES	The Applicant is proposing extensive visual mitigation through offsets and planting, which will establish over time to soften and screen views into the Sites. The Applicant has further revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. An updated description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This can be found within the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			reduced in size. This will set back the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located from residential dwellings. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the PV modules further away from Isleham and Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back to allow for archaeological mitigation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced. This will set back the solar area away from residential dwellings in the area. Large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting and the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W13, W14 and W16 (as shown in Figure 4-5 of the Environmental Statement EN010106/APP/6.3]) have been removed from the development and therefore the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located is being set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10 and W11. Landscape treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village. Further details concerning the landscaping being proposed across the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can be found in Chapter 10: Landscape and visual amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	You state that “proposals further developed considerably reducing the degree to which the scheme impacts on nearby communities?” How does this relate to our community in Isleham when the development is 400m from our village?	YES	The Applicant has developed the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm through an iterative process. The Applicant revised the design following the non-statutory consultation which saw the red line boundary move away from Freckenham and closer to Isleham. The Applicant has again revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm in light of feedback received through the statutory consultation. This has removed fields south of Beck Road from solar development and reduced the massing of the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located close to Isleham. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the Sunnica Energy Farm further away from Isleham. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	It will have negative impacts on the character and setting of local Cambridgeshire villages.	NO	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges that there will be a change to the character of the area. The Scheme design has sought to minimise this change through the careful siting of the PV modules and the provision substantial new planting and incorporation of setbacks.
Site selection	Encasing villages in solar panels is not suitable.	YES	The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme encases any villages close to it. Further, the Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced. This will set the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located back from

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Isleham and Worlington. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. In addition to this, the BESS at E33 will be set further back from Ferry Lane. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B have also been reduced in size. This will set the project back from residential dwellings in the area. Large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting and the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W14 are being set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Extensive treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impacts on Kennett Garden Village. Taken together, and with the design changes made by the Applicant following the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant considers that the visibility of the PV modules will be reduced by the distance from the villages, the intervening vegetation and the proposed planting. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	Sunnica East is too close to Burwell.	YES	The Applicant considers that Sunnica East is not too close to Burwell. Sunnica East is more than 10km along the cable route corridor from Burwell. The part of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm that is closest to Burwell is the National Grid substation extension; the impacts from which have been fully assessed and will be appropriately mitigated. Further information on the technical assessments can be found within chapters 6 to 16, and further information on the Scheme design can be found in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	Sunnica West would surround Snailwell.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. The resulting design is set well back from Snailwell and will not surround it. A project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application this can be found within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This demonstrates that the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced. This will set back the developable solar area from residential dwellings. Large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting. Large areas of W01 and W02 have been removed from solar development as a result of ecological mitigation and heritage offsets. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	Sunnica West would surround Chippenham.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The changes include a reduction in the size of Sunnica West Site A that has resulted in a smaller area where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located close to Chippenham. Large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting and W13, W14 and W16 (as shown in Figure 4-5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]) have been removed from the Order limits. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The Sunnica East site is too close to residential areas and should be reduced in size or moved away.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. This will set back the project sites further back from residential dwellings in Worlington. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. This sites the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from Isleham. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	Sunnica West Site B is too close to village centres.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This can be found within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site B have been reduced. Significant areas of W01 and W02 are allocated for ecological mitigation and heritage offsets. This will set further back the solar areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located from residential dwellings in the area. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	Burwell is already surrounded by solar panels.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area in its assessment of cumulative impacts. This been carried out to ensure that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm takes account of other developments in its final design. Further information can be found in Appendix 5A: Cumulative schemes of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant is bringing forward the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. In selecting the sites for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm, the Applicant considered a number of alternative sites, including brownfield sites. Further information can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Site selection	The Sunnica West sites are too close to Worlington.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the Sunnica West sites are too close to Worlington. The Sunnica West sites are located to the East of Snailwell, to the South of Chippenham and to the West of Kennett. The closest point on the Sunnica West sites to Worlington is more than 4km in a straight line. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B have been reduced in size. This will set back the project from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from Isleham and Worlington.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3], which includes a narrative of the design evolution. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	Sunnica East virtually engulfs the village of Worlington.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been reduced. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This will further set the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located back from Worlington. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3], which includes a narrative of the design evolution, includes a description of the design evolution. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	Worlington will be surrounded by 2.5-5m high industrial installations from all angles.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B have been reduced in size. This will set back the areas

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located from residential dwellings. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This moves the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response. The maximum height of the PV modules will be 2.5m above ground level. These will form the majority of the infrastructure around Worlington, but these will be interspersed with solar stations which will house infrastructure up to 3.5m high. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Site selection	Both the Eastern sites run between and encase ancient farming villages.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been reduced in size. This will set back the PV modules further back from residential dwellings in Worlington. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. This sites the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from Isleham. Further information can be found

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The Sunnica East sites will surround the village of Isleham.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application this can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been reduced in size. This will set back the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located away from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E07 is no longer proposed to be built on. This sites some of the developable solar area further away from Isleham. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The Scheme is too close to Red Lodge.	YES	The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is too close to Red Lodge. Aside from the field at W15 the development is situated on the western side of the A11 which provides good existing screening from Red Lodge. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B have been reduced. This will set back the proposed development away from residential dwellings in the area. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W14 and W16 have both been removed. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Further landscape treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The Sunnica East sites circle Freckenham.	YES	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been reduced in size. This will set back those sites further back from Freckenham. In particular, parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development. In addition to this, parcels E11 and E23 are also no longer proposed for solar development which would increase the distance between the proposed solar sites and Freckenham Road. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	Snailwell is a conservation village, the impact on the landscape and the huge increase in traffic during construction and monitoring the site hardly fall into the guidelines of conservation.	YES	Snailwell Conservation Area has been considered in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Views along Chippenham Road towards the park have been maintained by setting development back from the road. In addition, a buffer has been incorporated by the enhancement of existing planting around the development. The assessment has concluded that there will be a minor adverse (not significant) effect on the Snailwell Conservation Area.
Site selection	Sunnica East Site A envelops houses.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application this can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A have been reduced in size. This will set back the developable solar area away from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E07 is no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the Scheme further away from Isleham. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The fact this proposed development is to be built surrounding residential villages	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	shows Sunnica's lack of care and consideration towards the local residents.		Site A and B have been reduced This will set the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located back from Isleham and Worlington. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. In addition to this, the BESS at E33 will be set further back from Ferry Lane. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B have also been reduced in size. This will set the project back from residential dwellings in the area. W13, W14 and W16 have been removed from the Scheme, and large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Extensive treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village. Taken together, and with the design changes made by the Applicant following the non-statutory consultation, the Applicant considers that the visibility of the PV modules will be reduced by the distance from the villages, the intervening vegetation and the proposed planting. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The local communities impacted by the development are small e.g., Snailwell has 30 houses. The impact of the proposals will cause significant disruption.	NO	The Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment found no potential significant adverse effects on socio-economics and land-use during the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Scheme, apart from temporary significant effects on users of some Public Rights of Way (PRoW) which will be temporarily closed during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. For further information, please see Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme is set back from residential dwellings in the area. Large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting and screen the Scheme from Snailwell. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response. .
Site selection	The substation is located too close to Red Lodge and two primary schools.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced with the removal of W13, W14 and W16 and a reduction in size of W15. This will set back the Scheme from residential dwellings in the area. The Scheme will not be visible to any of the homes or schools at Red Lodge as it is situated on the other side of the A11 and screened from view by existing vegetation. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from the Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	The relationship between Isleham and Freckenham is ruined by the proposals.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. One of the changes has been to remove parcel E07 from solar development. This means that none of the fields to the immediate south of Beck Road will be built on. In addition to this, the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) located at E33 has been set back further from Ferry Lane. This has further reduced the landscape impact of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm when travelling between Freckenham and Isleham. The Applicant is proposing a significant volume of planting between parcel E05, Beck Road and Isleham to screen the Scheme from view. Further information on the Applicant's proposals for landscape and visual mitigation can be found in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The rural aspect binds Freckenham, Chippenham and Worlington together and this will be disrupted as a result of the Scheme.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. One of the changes has been to remove parcel E07 from solar development. This means that none of the fields to the immediate south of Beck Road will be built on. In relation to Worlington, the PV modules have been offset from the village via the removal of PV modules from E11 and E23 following the consultation. The rural landscape between Freckenham and Worlington will therefore remain. The Scheme design has also set the PV modules back from the road networks. Retained vegetation and new planting between the PV modules and road networks will reduce the perception of the change in

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			land used. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual receptors and sought to reduce the potential effects of the Scheme through embedded mitigation which has been built into the Scheme design. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The area is characterised by the open landscape and it separates the various villages. This proposal will affect the character of the area significantly.	YES	Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the mitigation measures which are embedded within the Scheme to ensure the impacts are localised and significant adverse effects are avoided to the wider area. The change to the open character in the landscape, via the introduction of PV modules and associated structures is acknowledged in Chapter 10.
Site selection	The quarrying was undertaken as a National Requirement and there are still reserves on the land that Sunnica is proposing to develop closest to Red Lodge.	NO	The Applicant has identified that Mineral Safeguarding Areas for sand and gravel are located within the Order limits. As the resource will not be lost permanently it is not anticipated to have a significant effect. Further information on this can be found within the Chapter 12: Socio-economics and land use of the Environmental Statement.
Site selection	The Scheme is too close to Badlingham.	NO	Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact and the perception of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm from Badlingham. PV modules in parcels E19-22 have been located within smaller field parcels to reflect the landscape pattern and retain intervening pine lines. New woodland is proposed around the perimeter of the parcels. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation. An

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been reduced in size. This will set back the developable solar area further away from residential dwellings in the area. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The Scheme is too close to Kennett.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. Landscaping has been proposed at parcel W15 and this landscaping treatment on the eastern boundary will help mitigate the impact on Kennett. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The Scheme is too close to Barton Mills.	NO	Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting to the north and east of parcels E24 and E25 to screen the PV modules and additional hedgerow and woodland planting adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views for motorists. The PV modules within parcels E26-29 have been offset from boundary vegetation to retain the landscape pattern and screen the PV

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			modules from wider views. Details of the Applicant's design for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further information relating to the Applicant's proposals for landscape and visual mitigation can be found in Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.
Site selection	The Scheme is too close to West Row.	NO	Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to reduce its visual impact and the perception of the project from West Row. New woodland planting has been proposed to screen parcels E02, E03 and E04. PV modules in E01 have been offset from the Fen woodland and Lee Brook. The proximity to the woodland of E01 will screen views from the wider landscape to West Row. The Applicant has revised the design of the proposals following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been reduced in size. This will further set back the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	Who decided to kill all these rural villages?	NO	The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. In addition, extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in the Outline LEMP submitted as part of the ES (see Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Site selection	The site location is due to the ease of land acquisition rather than suitability.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. This analysis demonstrates that the Site's location is suitable.
Site selection	Why is this the area for the largest solar farm in Europe?	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is suitable. In terms of generating capacity, the proposed Scheme would not be the largest in Europe.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	I object to the selection of unallocated greenfield land over brownfield sites for energy production.	NO	Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land as opposed to greenfield land when selecting the land for the Scheme. This is discussed in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment concludes that previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the search area for the Scheme.
Site selection	I do not believe you have properly considered other sites.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. This analysis demonstrates that the Sites location are suitable.
Site selection	We call for the site selection process to clearly and openly demonstrate that brownfield sites have been identified and fully explain the reasons for not pursuing this as the preferred option.	NO	Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land as opposed to greenfield land when selecting the land for the Scheme. This is discussed in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] The assessment concludes that previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the search area for the Scheme.
Site selection	Being within 15 miles of Burwell is not a sufficient justification for siting the Scheme here.	NO	The search for the point of connection was undertaken in East Anglia because it is considered to be an optimal region in the UK to locate a large scale solar farm, given its high levels of irradiation compared to

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			other parts of the UK. In addition, the topography is predominantly made up of and characterised by large areas of flat open land. The search for the point of connection involved discussions with UK Power Networks, Eastern Power Networks and National Grid to identify available capacity in the region. Capacity in the national grid in this region is limited and there are restricted opportunities to connect to the grid. The search identified Burwell as a location which has the available capacity for the Scheme with reinforcement that could be completed within a reasonable timeframe and cost. Additionally, the substation is in proximity to areas of lower grade agricultural land that could site a large scale solar farm. Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides further explanation for the chosen point of connection at Burwell Substation. It also provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified. From the Point of Connection at Burwell, a 15km radius is considered by Sunnica Limited to be the maximum viable distance for the area of search potential sites based on cost estimates provided by their independent connection provider/contractor.
Site selection	What other areas of the UK have you surveyed?	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified. This analysis demonstrates the suitability of the Site's location.
Site selection	No data has been shared assessing brownfield sites.	NO	Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land as opposed to greenfield land when selecting the land for the Scheme. This is discussed in Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] The assessment concludes that previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the search area for the Scheme.
Site selection	In the last two years vast cabling was laid from Burwell to Lakenheath, can you evidence you have scoped alternative land nearer to Lakenheath and potential use of this newly created infrastructure?	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified. From the Point of Connection at Burwell a 15km radius is considered by Sunnica Limited to be the maximum viable distance for the area of search potential sites based on cost estimates provided by their independent connection provider/contractor. Therefore, Lakenheath falls outside of the viable search area for potential sites.
Site selection	What other areas have been scoped in East Anglia and Lincolnshire?	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2], which provides a detailed assessment and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. This includes the reasons for the area of search identified.
Site selection	Has any land nearer to Cambridge been considered as this would be closer to Burwell?	NO	Land nearer to Cambridge has been assessed but is not considered to be suitable for the Scheme. From the Point of Connection at Burwell a 15km radius is considered by Sunnica Limited to be the maximum viable distance for the area of search potential sites based on cost estimates provided by their independent connection provider/contractor. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified.
Site selection	Why has Burwell been chosen by you if you still have to make large amounts of changes to the substation?	NO	The search for the point of connection was undertaken in East Anglia because it is considered to be an optimal region in the UK to locate a large scale solar farm, given its high levels of irradiation compared to other parts of the UK. The topography is predominantly made up of and characterised by large flat open land. The search for the point of connection involved discussions with UK Power Networks, Eastern Power Networks and National Grid to identify available capacity in the region. Capacity in the national grid in this region is limited and there are restricted opportunities to connect to the grid. The search identified Burwell as a location which has the available

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			capacity for the Scheme with reinforcement that could be completed within a reasonable timeframe and cost. Additionally, the substation is in proximity to areas of lower grade agricultural land that could site a large scale solar farm. Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides further explanation for the chosen point of connection at Burwell Substation. It also provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified. From the Point of Connection at Burwell a 15km radius is considered by Sunnica Limited to be the maximum viable distance for the area of search potential sites based on cost estimates provided by their independent connection provider/contractor.
Site selection	You obviously believe you could walk all over a small community and that it would be easier to bulldoze through our smaller rural villages.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. In addition, extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in the Outline LEMP submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Site selection	Given the UK is not the sunniest of places, with long, dark winters, we question whether the benefits of the scheme outweigh the scale of the project and the impact on land use.	NO	The UK climate does support the use of solar. The search for the point of connection was undertaken in East Anglia because it is considered to be an optimal region in the UK to locate a large scale solar farm, given its high levels of irradiation compared to other parts of the UK. While the weather does mean there is an element of variability in solar energy generation, this can be mitigated by developing larger generation capacities (to maximise output during periods of low irradiation); by connecting assets to different parts of the NETS; by developing projects with complementary profiles (for example wind: see below); or by developing integration technologies (for example, battery storage or participation in the hydrogen economy). There are several other technologies which can be used to compensate for the intermittency of renewable generation, such as electricity storage, interconnection and demand side response. Please see the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] for further information. The Applicant is bringing forward the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant recognises that is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation.
Site selection	It is not acceptable that the Alternative Sites Assessment report will only be submitted at the DCO stage.	NO	The alternatives chapter of the PEIR presented an overview of the methodology for site selection and the key reasons for selecting land for the Scheme. The information presented was appropriate for the preliminary environmental information report which accompanied the statutory consultation. Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides the detailed assessment and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme. The consultee will have an opportunity to make submissions on that document during the course of the examination, assuming the Secretary of State accepts the Application.
Site selection	In May 2019 I requested Sunnica to provide me with alternative sites. I have an email reply dated 14th May 2019 from [member of the project team] in which they state "We have identified and analysed a number of alternative sites." However he fails to provide details and whether brownfield sites were included. I enquired again in November 2019 and received an email this time from [member of the project team] dated 29th November 2019 and he states "We are in the process of preparing an analysis of alternative sites as part of the DCO application process. We will publish this information for you to view as part of our Preliminary Environmental Information Report during the statutory public consultation." The reply from	NO	The alternatives chapter of the PEIR presented an overview of the methodology for site selection and the key reasons for selecting land for the Scheme. The information presented was appropriate for the preliminary environmental information report which accompanied the statutory consultation. Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides the detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme. Consideration has been given to the use of previously developed land as opposed to greenfield land when selecting the land for the Scheme. The assessment concludes that previously developed land of the size required by the Scheme has not been found within the search area for the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	Sunnica dated 12th November 2020 from [member of the project team] states "As part of the (DCO) other sites that have been considered will be made publicly available during the schemes examination. This blatantly contradicts the remarks from [member of the project team] dated 29th November 2019 and therefore I have to assume you are deliberately concealing these alternative sites within this public consultation and the brochure.		
Site selection	The PEI Report does not provide any assessment of the necessity of the use of the land which forms the Sites, nor does it suggest or demonstrate that poorer quality land has been used in preference to higher quality land.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. This need is established in the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Survey has been undertaken, the results of which are presented in Appendix 12B of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The results demonstrate that 96.2% of the land within Sunnica East Sites A and B and Sunnica West Sites A and B are of ALC grade 3b or lower (i.e. not considered 'best and most versatile' land).
Land use	This development will affect the whole economic stability of this area as families move out of the area to get away from living surrounded by solar panels and businesses will close.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. Our assessments have found no long-term significant adverse impacts to the community. This report outlining these findings can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement: Socioeconomics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. In addition, the impact is considered acceptable in the context of the importance and benefits that the Scheme will bring. This has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant has committed to delivering a biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is outlined in its Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.1], with reference to the measures set out in the OLEMP (ES Appendix 10I) [EN010106/APP/6.2]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	No one wants to live among this, passing through miles of prison fencing.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. Whilst it is understood that the Scheme is different to what is on the site now, the Applicant does not consider the impact of solar to be negative. The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. In addition, the Applicant considers that the impact of the Scheme is acceptable in the context of the importance and benefits that the Scheme will bring. This has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant has committed to delivering a biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is outlined in its Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. The details of fencing design will be approved by the relevant local planning authority for each part of the development. The Applicant has made commitments in the OLEMP (ES Appendix 10I) [EN010106/APP/6.2] as to the design of the fencing.
Land use	I doubt the Sunnica directors would like anything like this on their doorstep.	NO	Our assessments have found no long-term significant adverse impacts to the community (Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]). The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. Details of the landscape design are provided within Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In addition, the impact is considered acceptable in the context of the importance and benefits that the Scheme will bring. This has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant has committed to delivering a biodiversity net gain. The

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is outlined in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].
Land use	The industrial nature of the development is not in keeping with the village and rural landscape in which it sits.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. Whilst it is understood that the Scheme is different to what is on the site now, the Applicant does not consider the impact of solar to be negative. The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation leading to very few residual significant landscape and visual effects. In addition, the impact is considered acceptable in the context of the importance and benefits that the Scheme will bring. This has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant has committed to delivering a biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is outlined in its ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	I have lived here all my life and to cover my village in plastic is a disgrace.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. Whilst it is understood that the Scheme is different to what is on the site now, the Applicant does not consider the impact of solar to be negative. The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation leading to very few residual significant landscape and visual effects. Details of the landscape design are provided within Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In addition, the impact is considered acceptable in the context of the importance and benefits that the Scheme will bring. This has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant has committed to delivering a biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is outlined in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	Lindcoly is closely surrounded by the panels and with Bridge End Road is the closest to the Battery Compound. It is possible their business will not survive.	NO	The Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment found there are no businesses or community facilities that would likely experience significant adverse effects during construction, operation or decommissioning. This report outlining these findings can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	It will affect the stud opposite.	NO	The Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment found there are no businesses or community facilities that would likely experience significant adverse effects during construction or operation. This report outlining these findings can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The Scheme is likely to affect La Hogue farm shop as access to it during construction will be very difficult, and unpleasant with dust raised.	NO	The Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment found there are no businesses that would likely experience significant adverse effects during construction or operation. This report outlining these findings can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Mitigation measures set out in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.3] will also seek to minimise effects arising from dust. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation which will further mitigate the visual impact of the Scheme. The updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. Different landscaping treatments have been introduced along the W10 and W11 boundary to further screen these parcels. There will be significant treatment on the eastern side of W15. Parcel W13 has been removed from solar development and more screening has been proposed at W14. Further information on landscaping is presented in

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The Golf Club and the course, both of which are world famous, share a common boundary with the proposed site of the development, which I am concerned will have an adverse environmental and visual impact on the course.	NO	The Scheme has been assessed to have a minor adverse impact on golfers at the Royal Worlington Golf Club. This is not considered significant and will comprise of a subtle change to the composition of the existing view. As planting matures, this is anticipated to reduce to a negligible adverse impact by year 15 of operation. Further information on landscape planting is presented in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting to the north and east of parcels E24 and E25 to screen the solar structures and additional hedgerow and woodland planting adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views for motorists and from views from the wider landscape to the north of parcels E30-32. The PV modules within parcels E26-29 have been offset from boundary vegetation to retain the landscape pattern and screen the PV modules from wider views. The Applicant has set out

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).
Land use	People have said that they are against Sunnica and feel that the proximity of it to our premises would put them off coming to visit my shop at La Hogue.	NO	Whilst it is understood that the Scheme is different to what is on the site now, the Applicant does not consider the impact of solar to be negative. The Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment found there are no businesses that would likely experience significant adverse effects during construction or operation. The relevant chapter of the Environmental Statement which includes these findings is Chapter 12 Socioeconomics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to consider the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation to reduce its visual impact. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation which will further mitigate the visual impact of the Scheme. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Different landscaping treatments have been introduced along the W10 and W11 boundary to further screen these

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			parcels. There will be significant treatment on the eastern side of W15. Parcel W13 has been removed from solar development and more screening has been proposed at W14.
Land use	Can local businesses register to win work if the project goes ahead, and how do they prequalify to be on the tender list?	NO	The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Sunnica Energy Farm and will source locally where possible. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This identifies a number of opportunities to promote local business involvement in the Scheme, including through building relationships with local business groups and by adopting a procurement strategy that maximises purchasing from local businesses. It is the Applicant's view that future manufacturing of such components in the UK is enabled through greater expertise and the locating of new solar projects in the UK.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	I own Brookside Stud Badlingham. During our 'Mating' season which runs from 14th February to 15th July we are constantly ferrying horses to and from the Stallion Studs in and around Newmarket for specific times to visit the stallions. They are roughly 20 minute slots and we have to arrive on time or we miss a covering, Dubawi Stud Fee £250k, Frankel £175k Kingman £170k to name just a few of the 40 or so Stallions that stand in Newmarket. The amount of traffic would cause a major headache on us 'Locals' who live and work in the area.	NO	The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed within Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CTMP and TP presented in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed across the Order limits during the construction phase. The assessment presented in Chapter 13 has concluded that there would be no residual significant adverse effects on transport and access during construction of the Scheme. The Application has included a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan in Appendix 13C [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application pursuant to which detailed traffic management plans will have to be developed. These will set out mitigation measures which will reduce the impact on the road network and local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The PEIR is contradictory- 13.8.25 states there are limited footways and pedestrian routes, but 13.8.24 states there is a wide network of PRow used for recreational purposes.	NO	The passages of reference discuss the impact on PRow in the proposed East Sites A and B. 13.8.24 discusses PRow in the surrounding area, whereas 13.8.25 discusses PRow in the immediate vicinity of the two sites. It is also worth noting that not all footways and pedestrian routes are PRows.
Land use	The impacts on pedestrian amenity are a major change not minor adverse as stated.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. No PRow will be removed. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase (the PEIR assumed closure of all PRow within the Order Limits for the entire construction period as a 'maximum impact' scenario; updated information is now available). When a PRow is temporarily closed there is will be alternative options available within the local area. Further the Applicant is proposing to create four new permissive routes within the Scheme to increase connectivity of the surrounding villages. The proposed locations are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further detail is contained within the ES, Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10I: Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	U6006, currently a quiet country lane through the East Site, can be reasonably alleged to subsist at a minimum of byway open to all traffic status. The amenity value being lost by the current proposals is immense caused by proposed fencing along either side of the 1.5-mile route as it is engulfed into the solar farm.	NO	Offsets from PRow have been incorporated into the Scheme design and all fencing will be installed behind any landscaping measures provided. No landscaping and fencing will be created on existing bridleways or PRow. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The revised Scheme design will also improve the visual impact on recreational routes in the Scheme's vicinity. Parcels E11 and E23 have been set back to improve the impact from the U6006, and proposed landscaping will enhance natural vegetation and screening along the route. Additional permissive routes will enhance the connectivity of the area to improve the relationships between villages.
Land use	There are routes which are unrecorded or under recorded within the site boundary and the surrounds that can be reasonably alleged to subsist at a minimum of bridleway or restricted bridleway status. These routes should be legally recorded as a condition of planning permission being granted.	NO	This would not be within the remit of the Applicant or the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Sunnica Energy Farm should be providing a network of new Public Rights of Way at a minimum of bridleway status.	YES	The Applicant is proposing to create a number of permissive routes within the Scheme to increase connectivity of the surrounding villages. Proposed locations are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Detail is contained within Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10I: Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan.
Land use	Public rights of way must be kept free of obstruction and debris for the full width of the route during construction.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Any temporary fencing alongside the route must be secured taut and not flapping in the wind. 'Heras' type fencing is sometimes covered with plastic to prevent windblown debris but it is almost impossible to secure so that it does not flap and rustle in wind and it should never be used alongside equestrian routes unless it can remain taut.	NO	This comment is noted. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP which is Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CEMP will be updated subject to the Applicant receiving development consent to include details of the final project design, including details of fencing. The Applicant will continue to engage with statutory consultees throughout this process, including rights of way officers at both host county councils.
Land use	Hazards overhead such as branches, cables or derricks should provide at least 3.4m clearance, preferably 3.7m in case a horse jumps or rears.	NO	This is noted. The Applicant has taken care to incorporate safe distances from bridleways during construction and the operating life of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Further information can be found in Appendix 16C: Framework CEMP and Appendix 16F: Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. It is not anticipated that there will be any overhang of construction equipment over PRowWs.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The PEIR does not analyse the kinetic views of moving through the installation, by car, by foot or by horse and how the visual impacts will be experienced.	NO	The Applicant's assessments of landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme are contained within Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and considered recreational and equestrian users travelling along roads and designated routes as part of a sequential and kinetic assessment.
Land use	The PEIR admits that no data has been collected and this has resulted in a serious underestimate of the impact of closing 204/5. The reality is that the effect of the closure would be major adverse and would affect a great many people for two years.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. No PRoW will be removed. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase (the PEIR assumed closure of all PROW within the Order Limits for the entire construction period as a 'maximum impact' scenario; updated information is now available). When a PRoW is temporarily closed there will be alternative options available within the local area.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Dispute the findings of the ALC survey.	NO	The Applicant's assessment of agricultural land classification within the Scheme can be found in Sections 12.6.10 to 12.6.13 and Table 12-11 of Chapter 12 (Socio-economics and Land Use) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Agricultural Land Classification data to be scrutinised by the local community.
Land use	The ALC survey should be made available to the public.	NO	The Applicant's assessment of agricultural land classification within the Scheme can be found in Sections 12.6.10 to 12.6.13 and Table 12-11 of Chapter 12 (Socio-economics and Land Use) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Agricultural Land Classification data to be scrutinised by the local community.,

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Sunnica do not know anything about farming, crops and soil structure.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) work on its behalf. An independent specialist sub-contractor was employed by the Applicant to deliver the specialist work investigating farming, crops and soil structure. Daniel Baird Soil Consulting was the specific sub-contractor and has the requisite knowledge and experience to deliver this work. Although both AECOM and Daniel Baird Soil Consulting are employed by the Applicant for these purposes, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. Appendix 12B Agricultural land baseline survey found within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out the findings of the baseline situation with regard the agricultural land. Further details on the impacts to farming are assessed within the Chapter 12: Socio-economics and land use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The wider site area has been identified as being located within an area of land comprising Grade 3 soils and Grade 4 land. These findings are the applicants. Independent scrutiny as part of the application and further consultation processes will help establish their reliability and accuracy.	NO	The Applicant's assessment of agricultural land classification within the Scheme can be found within Chapter 12 (Socio-economics and Land Use) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A baseline ALC survey has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 12B of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be scrutinised by the Planning Inspectorate, as well as a variety of statutory consultees during Examination.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	In the absence of any assessment of the effects of the Scheme on the availability of agricultural land, the significance of the Scheme's effect in relation to agricultural land availability cannot be determined. In turn, an assessment of the Scheme's harm in this context is not possible.	NO	The Applicant's assessment of agricultural land classification within the Scheme can be found within Chapter 12 (Socio-economics and Land Use) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A baseline ALC survey has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 12B of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	I have seen the yields increase exponentially thanks to irrigation and improved fertilisers etc. Therefore, I wholeheartedly disagree with the notion that this land is predominantly 3b and below - that is wrong.	NO	Drought is the dominant limiting factor at the site, with light textured soils and a warm, dry climate. Access to irrigation water is strictly limited through abstraction licences and can be curtailed further during droughts. Demand is rising on the same aquifers for non agricultural water use. Access to fertiliser has no influence on ALC grade. Access to irrigation was dropped as a reason to moderate ALC drought limitation in 1997 by Natural England. The Applicant has appended the evidence of this change in methodology from Natural England in Annex C of Appendix 12B of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Sunnica is playing down the soil quality which is wholly misleading and the facts being communicated to the public are simply false. This has to be further investigated.	NO	The Applicant's assessment of agricultural land classification within the Scheme can be found within Chapter 12 (Socio-economics and Land Use) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A baseline ALC survey has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 12B of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	The opportunity should be taken to see how the rights of way network can be improved.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application, and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The locations are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	There are very few rights of way actually within the areas under consideration so the importance of preserving them and/or providing an acceptable alternative is all the more important.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRow would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase (the PEIR assumed closure of all PRow within the Order Limits for the entire construction period as a 'maximum impact' scenario). When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. This was outlined in Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the PEI Report and has been detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Foreseeable closures of PRows are outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and scheduled based on the final design which will aim to minimise the duration of closure. As the PRows will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed as there are existing diversionary routes. The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	East Site A: It is not acceptable to close the most northerly section of Freckenham Bridleway 2 (Mortimer Lane which becomes Bridleway 7 on reaching the old road near Beck Bridge) for the duration of the construction period, as this would close the through route from Freckenham to Beck Bridge. A buffer strip incorporating the bridleway route could be provided leaving it open.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase (the PEIR assumed closure of all PRow within the Order Limits for the entire construction period as a 'maximum impact' scenario). When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. Foreseeable closures of PRowS are outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and scheduled based on the final design which will aim to minimise the duration of closure. As the PRowS will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.
Land use	East Site A: It is noted that there are no off-road links towards Isleham and West Row villages and this should be addressed as part of the scheme.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design, although these will not connect Isleham and West Row. One permissive path will run alongside Beck Road to connect Sheldrick's Road in Isleham with the PRow W-257/007/0 to the south-east. This will improve connectivity between Isleham and Freckenham. Details of the proposed permissive routes are provided in Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and shown in Figure 13-3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The permissive routes will be secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	East Site B: The green lane tunnelling from Rectory Farm on Elms Road NE to Worlington is not shown as a PRow but is an unclassified road and should not be closed.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to U6006 between Rectory Farm and Worlington. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close U6006 during construction. This would be closed for no longer than three weeks. Closures of PRows are outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and presented in Figure 13-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Fencing should be well set back from U6006 so as to not create a tunnel effect.	NO	The Applicant had regard to users of recreational routes in the development of the Scheme design. The Applicant is proposing to set fencing back from rights of way and has embedded significant mitigation into the Scheme design to soften the view of the Scheme. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I) submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	An off road link not necessarily following Cable Route A, but avoiding the A11 and continuing southerly would be an asset for pedestrians, riders and the La Hogue shop and restaurant.	NO	This would unfortunately fall outside of the Order limits and therefore has not been taken forward as an option.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Cable Route A is proposed to leave East Site B at its most south-easterly corner, immediately crossing Freckenham FP3 and, soon after, passing from Suffolk to Cambridgeshire at the River Kennett, then possibly crossing Chippenham FP7 and ultimately reaching the B1085 road and West Site A Freckenham FP3 and Chippenham FP7 form parts of a popular circular walk and any closure proposal will be opposed.	NO	This comment is referring to the PROW W-257/003/0 (Freckenham FP 3) and 49/7 (Chippenham FP 7) (shown in Figure 13-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). During construction of the cable route and of the Scheme, both these PROW will need to be closed for a up to three weeks. PROW closures are presented within Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and shown in Figure 13-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	East Site B: There are two public footpaths in the vicinity of this site, Freckenham footpath 10, which circuits a large field to the west of Badlingham Lane, from which the installation may be visible, and Freckenham footpath 3, running from Blandings Farm, Badlingham, to Heath Farm Road, Red Lodge, immediately 'over the hedge' from the south-western boundary of this site.	NO	Visual impacts on recreational users of Freckenham FP 10 (labelled PROW W-257/001/0 in the ES) have been assessed in the landscape and visual assessment presented in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Embedded mitigation has been included within the design to screen views of the PV modules and associated infrastructure. This includes tree planting, hedgerow planting and landscape offsets planted with native grassland. The layout of the landscape planting is shown in Figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, a minor adverse (not significant) effect is assessed for these receptors. No effects are predicted for these receptors during operation. It is not anticipated that Freckenham FP 10 will be closed during construction. Visual impacts on recreational users of Freckenham FP 3 (labelled PROW W-257/003/0 in the ES) have been assessed in the landscape and visual assessment presented in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. During construction, a moderate adverse (significant effect) is anticipated due to the presence of construction machinery. This effect is predicted to continue into year 1 of operation due to the partial change to the composition of the existing view. However, this effect is anticipated to no longer occur in year 15 of operation, because the landscape planting designed to screen views of the PV modules and associated infrastructure will have matured to screen the views. During construction of the cable route and of the Scheme, Freckenham FP 3 will need to be closed for a up to three weeks. PROW closures are presented within Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and shown in Figure 13-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Ramblers will be seeking recreational routes when proposals for Kennett Garden Village come forward, and it is likely that new residents will see the margins of the solar farm as part of the solution.	NO	Kennett Garden Village has been included in the shortlist of cumulative effects considered in the cumulatives assessment for the Scheme. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme is set back from residential dwellings in the area. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Extensive treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village. However, the Scheme will not provide space for recreational routes at this location.
Land use	West Site A: A potential permissive route could be created from La Hogue and incorporating part of the Coach Road.	NO	Locations of new permissive routes have been considered through the course of the design. W13, W14 and W16 (shown in Figure 4-5 [EN010106/APP/6.3] have been removed from the Scheme, so this suggested potential permissive route would unfortunately fall outside of the Order limits, and would not be possible. Details of the permissive routes are provided within Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and shown in Figure 13-3 [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	New permissive paths could create a recreational route from Red Lodge to Newmarket or Snailwell.	NO	The Applicant is grateful for this suggestion. Options for permissive routes have been sought within Sunnica West Site A, but these were not taken forward. The indicative permissive route locations are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further detail is contained within the ES, Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Cable Route B crosses Snailwell FP1, and a diversion to field-edge might be appropriate.	NO	Snailwell FP1 (labelled as 204/1 on Figure 13-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will need to be closed temporarily (for up to three weeks) during construction of the cable route. No permanent PROW diversions have been proposed throughout the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The cable route appears to cross Burwell footpaths 6, 7, 10 and 11 where the possibility of a bridge has been mentioned, and Newnham Drove.	NO	Burwell FP 10 (labelled 35/10 on Figure 13-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will need to be closed temporarily (for up to three weeks) during construction of the cable route. FP 6, 7 and FP 11 (labelled 35/6, 35/7 and 35/11 on Figure 13-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) run alongside a watercourse that will be crossed using trenchless techniques when constructing the cable route. This will mean the watercourse and PROWs will not need to be trenched, so closures will not be required at this location during construction. A bridge has not been taken forward within the Scheme design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	As the proposal will lead to the loss of Rights of Way, these should be re-instigated once the construction has finished or good alternative routes found.	NO	The Scheme will not result in the permanent loss of Rights of Way. All existing PRow within the Scheme boundary are retained and will be accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRow would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. This was outlined in Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the PEI Report and has been detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The British Horse Society believes that the proposals for the East Site A and B will create a huge loss of amenity value to the Public Rights of Way affected by these plans which must be mitigated by creating other equestrian routes.	NO	The Scheme will not result in the permanent loss of Rights of Way. All existing PRoW within the Scheme boundary are retained and will be accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRoW during construction. The PRoWs would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRoW is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. This was outlined in Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the PEI Report and has been detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has assessed the impacts on amenity to PRoW users of its proposals and considers that no significant effects arise. This assessment is included in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	New routes should be permanent public rights of way and not just permissive routes that will disappear when the site is decommissioned.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The permissive route locations are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further detail is contained within the ES, Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1]. As the Scheme is temporary, the Applicant will not have control over the land after the Scheme is decommissioned. The Applicant does not have the remit to create permanent rights of way.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	All of my local walks will be out of bounds to me for at least two years - including the walk off Elms Road across open fields to Worlington next to Lindcoly Kennels and the walk in the middle of the village down Mortimer Lane.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. This was outlined in Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the PEI Report and has been detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES.
Land use	Closures without alternative routes should be avoided and, if necessary, construction traffic managed to reduce the length of closures, rather than an automatic blanket closure throughout the period of construction.	NO	Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides the assessment on the local footpaths and roads. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some public rights of way during construction. Those that would be affected to during construction are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. As the PRowS will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed. Construction traffic will be managed to ensure minimal disruption to residents and local road users. A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be updated prior to construction following detailed design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Green Lane will be ruined.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. This will reduce the Scheme's impact on Green Lane (Badlingham Lane). The Applicant had regard to users of recreational routes in the development of the Scheme design. The Applicant is proposing to set fencing back from rights of way and has embedded significant mitigation into the Scheme design to soften the view of the Scheme. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.
Land use	Whilst the Scheme has been set back from Freckenham Road by the U6006, this does nothing to alleviate the overall impact.	NO	Following the statutory consultation, the set backs from Freckenham Road and U6006 have been increased, via the removal of PV modules in E11 and E23. In combination with the retained vegetation, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES predicts that the landscape and visual effects will be mitigated in relation to the surrounding area and people's views. It is acknowledged that there will be an evident change to the landscape character at the Site level even with the setbacks due to the change in land use.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	How much disruption will there be to public roads and footpaths during construction?	NO	Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides the assessment on the local footpaths and roads. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRow that would need to be closed would be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would be affected to during construction are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. As the PRow will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed. Construction traffic will be managed to ensure minimal disruption to residents and local road users. A Framework CTMP has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be updated prior to construction following detailed design.
Land use	The Gardens Trust would welcome the suggestion that the former drive at Chippenham Hall might become a permissive path, joining the existing public footpath.	NO	This would not be within the remit of the Applicant or the DCO application, however the Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes elsewhere as part of the Scheme design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Permissive paths not linked to the villages is hardly improving our amenity.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design to help improve connectivity. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The permissive route locations are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A (this will improve connectivity between Isleham and Freckenham); south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further detail is contained within the ES, Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	I would like to know if developing a cycle network to connect the villages has been considered? This would leave a positive legacy that would benefit the wellbeing of our communities and offset some of the justified unrest that opposes the Scheme.	NO	The development of a cycle network would not be within the remit of the Applicant or the DCO application, however the Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design to help improve connectivity between villages. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application, and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. The permissive route locations (are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further detail is contained within the ES, Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	A minimum width of 4m is required (preferably 5m),	NO	This comment is noted. The design of the permissive paths will be developed at detailed design stage, to be approved by the relevant local planning authority for each path, as required by the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	irrespective of any recorded width of the right of way.		
Land use	I object to solar panelling along both sides of the public footpath between Elms Road and Worlington.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation in relation to this route (U6006). Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting. The Applicant had regard to users of recreational routes in the development of the Scheme design. The Applicant is proposing to set fencing back from rights of way and has embedded significant mitigation into the Scheme design to soften the view of the Scheme. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in the Outline LEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The south-western most area of Sunnica West A abuts an extremely popular walk from Snailwell down to the Lime Kilns.	YES	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close this PRoW during construction (reference 204/5). Each affected PRoW would be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. The landscape and visual assessment presented in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses the impacts of the Scheme on the residential users of this PRoW 204/5, as well as the limekilns. During construction, users of the PRoW 204/5 will experience major adverse (significant) residual visual effects, and users of the limekilns will experience moderate adverse (significant) residual visual effects from the Scheme during construction. During operation year 1, these effects are expected to remain as those during construction, as vegetation

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			screening to the south of the Sunnica West Site A will not yet have matured. By operation year 15, once the vegetation screening has matured, the effect on users of the PRoW 204/5 is expected to reduce to not-significant. However, users of the limekilns will still experience a moderate adverse (significant) effect on views from the presence of solar infrastructure. In addition, it should be noted that the Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application, and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A has been reduced and large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting. Please refer to the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2].
Land use	Research has found that Stone Curlews are highly susceptible to disturbance with active responses being recorded at distances of up to 500m from a dog walker. It is not clear whether the mitigation for Stone Curlew will be located to avoid the potential for disturbance that would arise from the proposed permitted paths. Permissive routes should not be routed within 500m of likely Stone Curlew nesting areas, unless appropriate screening is already	NO	Surveys have been conducted to identify Stone Curlew nesting sites. This has informed the design of Sunnica Energy Farm, including the location of permissive paths. Details of the assessment of the Scheme's potential impacts on Stone Curlew are provided in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], which confirms no significant effects to Stone Curlew. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with the RSPB and Natural England.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	in situ e.g. existing visual barriers such as hedges, trees, walls. It would be inappropriate to create additional visual barriers as this could reduce the availability of suitable open habitat for Stone Curlews.		
Land use	Closure of public footpaths should not be permitted.	NO	Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides the assessment on the local footpaths and roads. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRoW during construction. The PRoWs that would need to be closed would be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would be affected to during construction are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRoW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. As the PRoWs will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed. Construction traffic will be managed to ensure minimal disruption to residents and local road users. A Framework CTMP has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be updated prior to construction following detailed design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Alternative routes for PRoW would mean an increase in traffic flow from residents attempting to reach these areas, parking places will also impact on the surrounding roads for these.	NO	The Applicant does not anticipate adverse impacts on traffic flows resulting from the proposed temporary closure of some PRoW. Foreseeable closures of PRoWs will be outlined in the Framework CTMP (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and scheduled based on the final design which will aim to minimise the duration of closure. As the PRoWs will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.
Land use	The main footpath between Snailwell and Chippenham will be crossed by a new road and your cabling work.	NO	Snailwell FP1 (labelled as 204/1 on Figure 13-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will need to be closed temporarily (for up to three weeks) during construction of the cable route.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The views from the Icknield Way and the footpath to Chippenham will be that of an industrial landscape if ruined.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed visual assessment which is included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Views from the Icknield Way will not be impacted, as the route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point). The Applicant had regard to users of recreational routes in the development of the Scheme design and in its assessment of the proposals. The Applicant is proposing to set fencing back from rights of way and has embedded significant mitigation into the Scheme design to soften the view of the Scheme. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (Appendix 10I) submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The Icknield Way PRoW should not close for the duration of the construction.	NO	Based on the Applicants understanding of the location of Icknield Way, the Scheme will not result in a closure of this path. The route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the Scheme at its closest point). None of the PROW will be closed for the duration of construction, instead those PROW that need to be temporarily closed will be closed for up to three weeks. Further details on those PRoW to be closed are provided in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. As the PRoWs will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no formal diversions have been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The area beside W03 & W04 is a key area for walkers.	YES	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close this PRoW of way during construction (reference 204/5). Each affected PRoW would be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. The landscape and visual assessment presented in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses the impacts of the Scheme on the residential users of this PRoW 204/5, as well as the limekilns. During construction, users of the PRoW 204/5 will experience major adverse (significant) residual visual effects, and users of the limekilns will experience moderate adverse (significant) residual visual effects from the Scheme during construction. During operation year 1, these effects are expected to remain as those during construction, as vegetation screening to the south of the Sunnica West Site A will not yet have matured. By operation year 15, once the vegetation screening has matured, the effect on users of the PRoW 204/5 is expected to reduce to not significant. However, users of the limekilns will still experience a moderate adverse (significant) effect on views from the presence of solar infrastructure. In addition, it should be noted that the Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A has been reduced and large areas of W03 and W04 include substantial native grassland planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Sunnica East A is on one of the only direct walking routes out of the village of Freckenham.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed to be built on. This removes the Scheme from impacting on walking routes from Freckenham to Isleham. The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. The permissive route locations are on Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B; and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. Further detail is contained within the Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Public access to open space has been highlighted by the pandemic.	NO	The Scheme will not result in the permanent loss of PRow. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRows would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary, and it is expected that the majority will be closed for less than the entire construction period. Further, the Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Public rights of way across/adjacent to the site should be protected, maintained and improved during and after construction and throughout the life of the Farm.	NO	The Scheme will not result in the permanent loss of Rights of Way. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRows would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is presented in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The provision for the extended byways needs to state and include the use for horse riders and it does not at the moment.	NO	This has been noted by the Applicant. The Applicant has not secured an agreement with the relevant landowners for the use of permissive paths by horse riders.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	On paths where horses are legally included and may be a common user—bridleways and restricted byways—a surface more appropriate to their use than to motor traffic should be provided. The BHS has found resin or polymer bound rubber crumb–grit compounds to be the most successful in providing resilient, free draining, smooth sur-faces which accommodate all users well.	NO	The permissive paths will neither be surfaced or bound to retain the existing field character. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the relevant local planning authority pursuant to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The ideal path surface preferred by horses and their riders or drivers is: • Non slip • Resilient, with some give (10 to 30mm at point load) • Well drained • Adequate bearing capacity to avoid erosion or poaching • Free from stones, especially if angular or sharp edged Types of path surface, in descending order of preference, are: • Short, firm, well-drained turf, which is ideal for horses and pedestrians, and usually firm enough for cycles and horse-drawn vehicles. • Vegetated paths on a firm base such as grassed over forest roads or disused railway tracks stripped of ballast to expose consolidated ash solum, which are ideal for support-ing year-round multi-use, provided they are well drained. • Paths where the natural vegetation is protected or reinforced by some type of partial surfacing, such as embedded stone. • Formally constructed paths with firm, non-slip surface. Sealed surfaces may be necessary to facilitate	NO	The permissive paths will neither be surfaced or bound to retain the existing field character. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the relevant local planning authority pursuant to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
	cycle or wheelchair access, but care should be taken to ensure that the finished surface is not hazardous to horses.		

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The proposals for the new off-road route of new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills the granite fines surface must be suitable for equestrians.	NO	We respectfully suggest this comment is from a response to a separate application, as these are located near Leiston.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Quarried aggregate without a consolidated dust wearing course is completely inappropriate for multi-use paths because angular stones will damage horses' feet and may result in serious lameness. Where it is used as a substrate or structural layer, the surface must be finished with 75-100mm depth compacted MOT type 1 (40mm-dust) dressed with dust to fill the spaces between the stones and consolidated to withstand rainfall.	NO	The permissive paths will neither be surfaced or bound to retain the existing field character. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the relevant local planning authority pursuant to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Any new construction or path restoration project should always provide a finished surface to this standard. It is not acceptable to leave an unconsolidated surface of stones following work. Any stony tracks may need improvement by topping-off with consolidated dust to avoid injury to horses.	NO	The permissive paths will neither be surfaced or bound to retain the existing field character. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the local planning authority pursuant to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Within Suffolk and Cambridgeshire, there is a both a demonstrable demand for safe access for equestrians and a documented lack of provision.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages and are shown on Figure 13-3 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the local planning authority pursuant to the DCO. The Applicant has not secured an agreement with the relevant landowners for the use of permissive paths by horse riders.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	In order to maximise opportunities within Suffolk to help provide more off-road links for equestrians they should support the automatic inclusion of horse riders on shared off-road routes, unless there are specific reasons why this is not possible.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages and are shown on Figure 13-3 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the local planning authority pursuant to the DCO. The Applicant has not secured an agreement with the relevant landowners for the use of permissive paths by horse riders.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Routes should be designed to accommodate both cyclists and equestrian users.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages and are shown on Figure 13-3 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the local planning authority pursuant to the DCO. The Applicant has not secured an agreement with the relevant landowners for the use of permissive paths by horse riders.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The Consultation booklet refers to 'increased pedestrian access' but this is not shown on any of the maps.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages and are shown on Figure 13-3 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Final details of the permissive paths will be approved by the local planning authority pursuant to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The proposed permissive route between W04 and W05 could be extended to allow access to the Woodland and Grassland at W06, W07, W08, W10.	NO	The Applicant is no longer taking the proposed permissive route in Sunnica West Site A. Details of the permissive routes are provided in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and land use [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Figure 13-3 [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The byway connecting Worlington to Badlingham provides an important route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders who want to travel from Worlington in a southwest direction. The only alternative routes are by road, none of which have footpaths making them impractical for walking, and given the volume and speed of traffic, unsafe for cycling or horse riding.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close this PRow during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary, up to three weeks. No PRow diversions have been proposed throughout the Scheme as it is considered that the short term duration of closure will cause disruption only for a short period of time, and other routes will be available during that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The native grassland planting adjacent to W04 and W03 on the archaeological areas together with the Woodland would make a great amenity.	NO	The Applicant welcomes the positive response of the great amenity of native grassland, which is also proposed across the remainder of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	A prior requisite enhancement should your scheme be given the go ahead would be a tarmac foot path beside the B1102 road from Freckenham to Worlington.	NO	This suggestion will unfortunately not be possible because this footpath does not fall within the Order limits of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing land for use within the Order limits to deliver the Scheme and to provide mitigation, where required, for impacts identified in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Improvements to existing footpaths outside of the Order limits are outside of the scope of the Scheme as they are not required to deliver the Scheme and nor are they required to mitigate its effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Footpath 204/1 between Snailwell and Chippenham is planned to be severed where the Grid Connection Route crosses it, which will mean that during the period of severance there will be no public footpaths available from Snailwell and it will be impossible to walk other than on roads that have no pavements, such as the proposed Newmarket Road	NO	Snailwell FP1 (labelled as 204/1 on Figure 13-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will need to be closed temporarily (for up to three weeks) during construction of the cable route. No PROW diversions have been proposed throughout the Scheme as it is considered that the short term duration of closure will cause disruption only for a short period of time, and other routes will be available during that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The proposals include the closure of Public Rights of Way in the vicinity of Worlington and Red Lodge for the duration of the construction period. Whilst the effects alone may be judged to be insignificant, when considered in combination with other plans and developments, there may be potential for recreational effects for example on Breckland SPA, and Red Lodge Heath SSSI.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. This would reduce the likelihood that recreational users would be diverted to alternative locations for recreation. Foreseeable closures of PRowS are outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and scheduled based on the final design which will aim to minimise the duration of closure. As the PRowS will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	There is concern that Worlington and Freckenham will effectively be cut off from recreational routes in the area during the construction phase. A phased approach should be adopted, and routes should only be closed for a minimum period, when works require it.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRow during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. Foreseeable closures of PRowS are outlined in the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and scheduled based on the final design which will aim to minimise the duration of closure. As the PRowS will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed. Further, the Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is available in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	What impact will there be on the two main footpaths – the Icknield Way and the footpath from Snailwell to Chippenham Fen - during the construction phase and once completed?	NO	Based on the Applicants understanding of the location of Icknield Way, the Scheme will not result in a closure of this path. The route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point). Snailwell FP1 (labelled as 204/1 on Figure 13-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will need to be closed temporarily (for up to three weeks) during construction of the cable route.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The Icknield Way is the only metaled path in the area, which means it can be used when all other routes for miles around are incapable of being walked upon due to weather.	NO	Based on the Applicants understanding of the location of Icknield Way, the Scheme will not result in a closure of this path. The route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	There are areas that could be made into public permissive areas or indeed permanent features. Mortimer Lane Freckenham has a footpath that heads along Lee Brook and to Beck Road to where these converge alongside E07, E06 and E05. I request that this be made into a feature with seating, signposts as waymarkers, and hides/shelters.	NO	This footpath that is being referred to in this comment (labelled as W-257/002/0, W-257/002/X and W-257/007/0 shown in Figure 13-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will connect to the permissive route proposed along Beck Road to connect with Sheldrick's Road in Isleham. This will improve connectivity between Freckenham and Isleham. Any additions to this existing footpath (W-257/002/0, W-257/002/X and W-257/007/0) will unfortunately not be possible, as it does not fall within the Order limits of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing land for use within the Order limits to deliver the Scheme and to provide mitigation, where required, for impacts identified in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Improvements to existing footpaths outside of the Order limits are outside of the scope of the Scheme as they are not required to deliver the Scheme and nor are they required to mitigate its effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Whilst the concessionary footpath from Badlingham Lane at the corner of Elevenways is welcomed, this is in fact an illogical route as it is a path to nowhere. This path needs to be extended north to meet Freckenham Road. This should be formally designated as a public footpath. The design of the footpath as put forward demonstrates the lack of local knowledge or proper site assessment, or perhaps the landowner's desire to apply for housing on the site in the future.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description and layout of the permissive routes has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The proposed permissive routes are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The proposed permissive route was designed to improve links between residential areas and existing PRoW. The Applicant has proposed additional permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	It is suggested in the Preliminary EIA (4.11.7) that pedestrians excluded from rights of way should walk down the Mildenhall road. Unless I am confused by the lack of clarity in the documents, this is the narrow, high speed route with no footway between the A11 at Red Lodge and the Walnut Tree PH in Worlington. This busy road also carries traffic from the A11 during local closures. This is therefore a dangerous suggestion.	NO	It is not clear what part of the PEI Report the comment is in reference to. PRowS will be temporarily closed for up to three weeks. Foreseeable closures of PRowS are outlined in the Framework CTMP within Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. Options proposed within Appendix 13C are considered to be safe routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The sheer volume of change and construction planned alongside or in the vicinity of the U6006 are incompatible with its preservation, and cannot be said to add to the character of the area or add to its quality.	NO	The Applicant has revised the Scheme proposals following the statutory consultation and has made the following changes to the Scheme design as illustrated on the Parameter Plans in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]: The extent of PV modules in proximity to U6006 has been reduced, with E11 and E23 removed and replaced by grassland Eco 3. The incorporation of Eco 3 increases the set back of PV modules from Worlington and West Row. The recreational value of U6006 will remain, along with improved recreational linkages via new permissive paths. Route U6006 is well vegetated, with parts of the route well enclosed by established trees. The perception of the Scheme will therefore vary from along U6006 and will reduce further with the establishment of new planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	There are signs that U6006 is of historic significance, warranting further research and protection. Some interesting mapping of the area is available in the Bury St Edmunds RO, and should have informed the scheme in the first instance. Local people refer to Badlingham Lane as "Green Lane", and it may have origins as a drovers' track.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. This will reduce the Scheme's impact on the U6006. The Applicant had regard to users of recreational routes in the development of the Scheme design. The Applicant is proposing to set fencing back from rights of way and has embedded significant mitigation into the Scheme design to soften the view of the Scheme. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Implications for where the road from Chippenham Road to Sunnica West B crosses the footpath i.e., increased traffic to Chippenham NNR/SSSI and footpaths accessing Park Farm, Chippenham and Snailwell.	NO	The Applicant does not anticipate adverse impacts on traffic flows or alternative footpaths resulting from the proposed temporary closure of some PRoW. When a PRoW is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. Foreseeable closures of PRoWs are outlined in the Framework CTMP (presented within Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and scheduled based on the final design which will aim to minimise the duration of closure. As the PRoWs will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The Sunnica plans call for the Icknield Way to be closed for two years but the path does not lie within the boundary of the scheme and no access to the scheme is proposed which requires the use of it. Based solely on the Sunnica documents, I see no reason to close it at all.	NO	Based on the Applicants understanding of the location of Icknield Way, the Scheme will not result in a closure of this path. The route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	I can imagine there may be short periods of time during which closure of the Icknield Way becomes necessary for safety reasons and I would ask that any such closure be restricted to the affected part of the path and be for the minimum length of time necessary.	NO	Based on the Applicants understanding of the location of Icknield Way, the Scheme will not result in a closure of this path. The route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point). PROW closures during construction are described in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Closures will be for a up to three weeks.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Concerned about the closure of the Snailwell gallops footpath during the construction process. I think this will significantly impact on the quality of life of local people.	NO	PROW 204/5 (shown in Figure 13-1 and 13-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will need to be temporarily closed for up to three weeks during construction. An assessment has been undertaken in Chapters 12, 13 and 15 of the ES [EN010106/AP/6.1] and no significant adverse effects on human health are expected due to this closure. However, moderate adverse (significant) temporary effects are anticipated on users of these PROW to be closed during construction due to temporary inconvenience. As the PROWs will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The 'Right to Roam' is the general public's right to access certain public or privately owned land, lakes, and rivers for recreation and exercise. Closing public access to footpaths for 2 years during construction with no alternative is a direct infringement of the Right to Roam.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some PRowS during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary, and it is expected that the majority will be closed for less than three weeks as identified in the ES. When a PRow is closed, there will be alternative options available in the local area. As the PRowS will be closed for a short duration (up to 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed. Further, the Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. Further details can be found in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scheme description is presented in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Equestrian users of the affected PROWs risk disturbance from the noise of the inverters, switchgear etc.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to locate solar stations (which is where inverters and switchgears will be located) away from PROWs. The proposed locations for solar stations can be found in the parameter plans included in the Environmental Statement Figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3] and secured through the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.3]. The locations of existing PROWs are shown in Figure 12-4. Those PROWs to be affected during construction are shown in Figure 12-5. The Applicant has assessed the impact of noise and vibration as a result of the Scheme. Noise emitted from the Scheme is not anticipated to have a significant impact on any of the assessed receptors at any stage of its lifetime, including equestrian users. This was detailed in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report and is presented in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration, of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. An OEMP will be followed throughout operation to ensure that potential environmental effects during operation are avoided, mitigated and managed where necessary. A Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) has been submitted with the DCO in Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Will the extra energy produced justify the cost in laying the cables and extending the Grid substation?	NO	There is a direct correlation between the amount of land the Applicant requires and the level of energy the Applicant is able to produce. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The proposed generating station has been designed on a scale that meets the significant costs involved with the laying of the cables and the National Grid substation extension. Details of how the Applicant intends to fund the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm during its operating life can be found in the Funding statement [EN010106/APP/4.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Sunnica has been unwilling to commit to a generating capacity making it impossible to assess the benefits of the project.	NO	The Applicant did not provide information on proposed generating capacity of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm during the statutory consultation as it is not applying to generate a certain amount of electricity. Improvements in technology could allow the Applicant to generate larger volumes of electricity and therefore it wouldn't wish to be tied to a less efficient generating capacity. Further information on this is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Such an approach is common across renewable energy projects and the Applicant has not specified a generating capacity in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of its DCO application. The development (including the solar generating station and BESS) will instead be controlled and limited by the DCO requirements, areas shown on the works plans, design principles (which include maximum parameters) and impacts assessed in the ES. This is more appropriate than limiting the development to a set capacity. An assumption has been made as to the annual production from the site in terms of kWh in order to calculate the potential impact on the climate. Details of this calculation can be found within Chapter 6 - Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. Further information can be found in Chapter 6: Climate Change within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. This need is established in the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1. Further

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The distance from the grid will drive significant efficiency losses which will offset some of the benefits of the solar generation.	NO	The Applicants independent connection provider/contractor has determined that the viable maximum distance of the Scheme from the Point of Connection (POC) at Burwell is a 15km radius. This is because efficiency losses would not be significant within this radius. From the POC at Burwell a 15km radius is considered by the Applicant to be the maximum viable distance for the area of search. This threshold was set based on an estimation of the maximum cost that would be viable for the Scheme to meet the target financial metrics. Further information is provided within Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	We urge Sunnica to publish how much electricity this scheme could produce and how many homes it could power, which we would expect to see in the consultation.	NO	The Applicant did not provide information on the number of homes that it expects to be powered by the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm during the statutory consultation as it is not applying to generate a certain amount of electricity. Improvements in technology could allow the Applicant to generate larger volumes of electricity and therefore it wouldn't wish to be tied to a less efficient generating capacity. Further information on this is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Such an approach is common across renewable energy projects and the Applicant has not specified a generating capacity in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of its DCO application. The development (including the solar generating station and BESS) will instead be controlled and limited by the DCO requirements, areas shown on the works plans, design principles (which include maximum parameters) and impacts assessed in the ES. This is more appropriate than limiting the development to a set capacity

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The capacity of the energy storage proposed for the BESS '500 MW' i.e., the same as the rated capacity of the whole scheme. This is an absurdity, since '500 MW' is a power rating, not an energy storage capacity in MWh.	NO	The final energy capacity of the proposed BESS for the Sunnica Energy Farm has not yet been determined. Changes in technology and market characteristics mean that the decision with regards the energy storage capacity in MWh will only be known once detailed design is undertaken. At this stage in the development process, the design has identified maximum parameter areas within the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm where the BESS will be located and indicative specifications for their design. Further information on this is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It is important to note that the storage capacity of the proposed Scheme is not a direct cause of environmental impacts and therefore would not be controlled by the Applicant's Development Consent Order (DCO). Aspects such as size, noise and location are direct causes of environmental impacts and therefore are be subject to controls within the Applicant's DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	If the figures quoted in the original pre-consultation of a 500MW solar farm, this would only produce circa 50MW, of which 5 months of the year it would only produce 10MW of electricity.	NO	The Applicant does not recognise the source of these figures. Solar energy generation from the PV portion of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is estimated to be 653,973 MWh per year in the first year of operation. This is the estimate based on electricity production from the PV. Further information on this is available in Chapter 13: Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	I understand this need, especially with regard increase in the use of power and population.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	This plan of yours is based on pure greed, obtain planning permission and sell on regardless.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. Further information can be found in Chapter 6: Climate Change within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	It is an essential infrastructure project.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	As far as I see it is just for profiting off the National Grid.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	This is an excellent plan to contribute to the UK carbon emissions targets.	NO	The Applicant agrees with the comment. Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] concluded that "the renewable energy generation of the Scheme overall is considered to have a major beneficial effect on the climate".

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	There is no clear summary of the benefits of the Scheme and their significance.	NO	A summary of the benefits of the Scheme is provided in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. Environmental assessments are provided in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the residual significant effects (beneficial and adverse) are summarised in Chapter 18 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scheme would play its part in security of electricity supply and would bring cost benefits to electricity consumers, both of which are identified in government policy as being required for resilient energy supplies in the future. In addition to meeting the urgent national need for secure and affordable low carbon energy infrastructure, the Scheme provides a number of local benefits in relation to biodiversity, heritage, soils and water quality, employment and access. The delivery of these benefits is supported by planning policies, as discussed in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2]. With the exception of employment, these benefits have been as a result of the choice of location for the Scheme and the iterative scheme design process which the Applicant has undertaken and is discussed in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The Scheme is expected to deliver a biodiversity net gain of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Biodiversity net gain is an approach to development which aims to leave biodiversity in a measurably better state than before. This approach still relies on the application of the mitigation hierarchy to avoid, mitigate or compensate

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			for biodiversity losses however, net gain is additional to these approaches, not instead of them. The net gain approach results in a net residual gain for biodiversity over the development life cycle. Further information can be found in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010106/APP/6.7]. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate during operation. Details of this assessment can be found in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	These proposals are forward thinking and go towards meeting climate targets.	NO	The Applicant agrees with the comment. Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] concluded that "the renewable energy generation of the Scheme overall is considered to have a major beneficial effect on the climate".

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The project is not needed.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. It is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate and this is discussed further within Chapter 6 Climate Change, of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	We have to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels.	NO	This is noted

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The UK needs to be more self-sufficient in terms of energy supplies, we are too reliant on other countries. The Scheme is therefore supported.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The need for power will always be with us and we need to increase our energy security to sustain our way of living.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Ruining the countryside for you do gooders and your electric cars/ own benefit.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Sunnica Energy Farm has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. Please see the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in Chapter 6, Climate Change.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	This should be built as soon as possible.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	There is an economic harm of relying on fossil fuels.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	I don't believe there is a climate emergency and the obsession with producing alternate energy types is way out of proportion to the facts on climate change.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The UK is undergoing a major change in the way it meets its energy needs. In 2019, the Government legislated to commit the country to achieving 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2050. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	It seems a waste of already produced energy to export it all the way back to our villages just to resell it to the grid again, exporting it back again, that is ineffective.	NO	The Scheme will provide energy directly to the national grid. Supplying electricity to the local villages directly is not proposed as part of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	What are “the other services to support the operation of the National Electricity Transmission System” provided by the battery storage? We need more clarity about the “other services” and their impact upon the Scheme and the environment?	NO	The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information can be found in the Statement of Need EN010106/APP/7.1], particularly at Table 10.1, submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Sunnica have not shown anywhere in their consultation that there is, from a national perspective a need for a solar farm at this scale and in this type of environment, and that any such need outweighs the negative impacts on agricultural production and the local environment.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. This need is established in the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application sets out how the national need for the Scheme outweighs any adverse impacts on the local environment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	There is a need for green energy projects generally.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	There is a need for green energy projects in the area.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The needs case is ridiculous and has no specific relevance to our area.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. A full Statement of Need was not provided at the PEI Report stage, the Applicant has now set out the needs case for the proposed Scheme within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. This sets out the importance of delivering new sources of renewable energy generation, at scale, to meet the UK's legal requirement to decarbonise. The proposed Scheme is one such project that contributes to this urgent requirement. It is important to build such projects in the areas that are best suited to them in order to maximise the benefits of each project. The Scheme location is close to a grid connection at Burwell and has suitable levels of irradiation to support efficient solar energy generation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Putting panels on new buildings and retrofitting solar panels would provide a huge percentage of energy needs and remove the need for this scheme and it is within the capabilities of the government so there is no needs case for this site	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, small, solar developments on buildings but will complement them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant has provided a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of its DCO application setting out the need for the Scheme in the context of the need for renewable energy generation more widely.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The Scheme is five developments rolled into one and should not be classed as an NSIP.	NO	The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm represents one development. The resulting generating station is defined as a NSIP as an onshore generating station in England exceeding 50MW. The Scheme as a whole will substantially exceed the 50MW generation threshold, as would each of Sunnica East Site A, Sunnica East Site B and Sunnica West Site A, individually. It is a single development, being progressed by a single applicant and will connect to the national electricity transmission system via a single connection under a single connection agreement. The constituent Sites could not come forward alone as it would not be viable to install the grid connection without the scale of development that is proposed, and further, the Sites also share common facilities which demonstrate the intrinsic relationship between them. Examples of this include the onsite substations, BESS and warehouses. In addition, the separation of the Sites is part of the iterative design process which Sunnica has progressed which delivers designed-in mitigation and which in turn reduces the overall environmental impact. For example, one large contiguous site would lead to increased landscape and visual impacts on the host community when compared with the approach Sunnica has taken. As such the Applicant considers the design solution of the Sites, which each form part of the single solar generating station connected to the national electricity transmission system by the same cable under the same connection agreement is an intrinsic part of its mitigation strategy to reduce the impact on the environment and the host communities. Further information on this is provided within the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant has provided details of the importance of scale in solar development in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. Projects of

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			the scale of the proposed Scheme are able to achieve efficiencies of scale and are subject to shorter development timescales. This is because all projects are subject to fixed development, construction and operational costs. These increase as the number of individual schemes delivering the same output increases. The Applicant therefore believes that there are clear benefits to proceeding with a single large-scale project over a number of individual smaller projects with the same total output.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The scale of the farm is far too large.	Yes	There is a direct correlation between the amount of land required and the level of energy the Applicant would be able to produce if granted consent. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The scale of the Scheme has been reduced in response to comments received during statutory consultation. The areas for PV modules and associated infrastructure have been removed from E06 and E07, and instead will be set aside for habitat creation with Stone Curlew nesting plots integrated. These are now ECO1 and ECO2. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on and will now be planted with species-rich native grassland and set aside as ECO3. This sites the developable solar area further away from Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. W16, W14 and W13 have also been removed from the Scheme, which also has the effect of setting the solar back further from residential dwellings. Further information on the Scheme design development can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The Scheme is three times larger than any other in the UK.	NO	There is a direct correlation between the amount of land required and the level of energy the Applicant would be able to produce if granted consent. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. Section 9.3 in particular explains why it is necessary for the Scheme to come forward at scale.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The Scheme needs to be excessively large in size to pay for the additional cost of the pipeline, proving it's in the wrong place.	NO	There is a direct correlation between the amount of land required and the level of energy the Applicant would be able to produce if granted consent. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. In particular it is explained at section 9.3 why scale in solar projects is important. The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme is in the wrong place. An analysis of potential alternative locations for the Scheme has been undertaken and is presented in the Alternatives and Design Evolution chapter of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Smaller schemes with a direct connection to the grid are more suitable as there is less requirement for substation equipment.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Scheme is not an alternative to a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	I would support the Scheme if it was reduced in size and it was built away from agricultural land.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. This has included reducing the size of Sunnica East Site A, Sunnica East Site B and Sunnica West Site A. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B: Soils and Agricultural Baseline Report of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	East Site A is an appropriate size.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	East Site B is too large.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. This will set back the solar areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located back from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the developable solar area further away from Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Is West Site B needed, considering West Site A is so large?	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant ecological mitigation through grassland and wetland planting into the design of West Site B. Further information can be found in Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP including within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. This includes a reduction in the size of Sunnica West Site A. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W16, W14 and W13 has been removed which also has the effect of setting the solar back further from residential dwellings. This can be seen in Appendix 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Further information can also be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	West Site B is a good size.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	West Site A is too big.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A has been reduced. This will set back the developable solar area away from residential dwellings in the area. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W13 and W14 has been removed and this has the additional effect of being set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Landscaping treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Would support if the scale was reduced and it was built away from residential areas.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located on Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. This means the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located have been set back further from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located further away from both Isleham and Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced. This will set back the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located from residential dwellings in the area. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W13 and W14 have been removed and this has the effect of setting back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Landscape treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	That is a lot of land.	NO	There is a direct correlation between the amount of land required and the level of energy the Applicant would be able to produce if granted consent. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The size of the project gives a relatively poor return on energy.	NO	There is a direct correlation between the amount of land required and the level of energy the Applicant would be able to produce if granted consent. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The cost of solar energy generation in the UK is already competitive when compared to alternative renewable energy technologies. Solar energy generation is important in smoothing out seasonal varieties in generation alongside other technologies. The Applicant believes that solar has an important role to play as part of a diverse generation mix with other forms of renewable energy. Importantly, large scale solar can come online quickly and deliver significant volumes of renewable energy within timeframe required for the UK to meet its legal decarbonisation targets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The group could not give any idea of the number of solar panels likely to be used so there is no reassurance of the ring fencing of the size of the battery site in any of the three areas.	NO	The Applicant will be required to obtain approval for the detailed design of the Scheme once development consent is granted and prior to it commencing development. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be subject to approval post consent. The Applicant has within its Application stated the parameters for which it is seeking development consent. As such the Applicant will only be able to build the proposed scheme within the areas shown on the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] and within defined parameters that have been used for the purposes of environmental assessment. Each key piece of infrastructure, such as the BESS, must be built within the parameters that have been set out in the Application. These parameters are secured by the DCO ([EN010106/APP/3.1]. Therefore, there will be absolute certainty of the parameters of development. This will not include the number of PV modules as that metric is not relevant, rather the size of the PV modules are and they will be subject to control by the development consent order.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	It is extensive but necessary for renewable energy.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The size has not been reduced despite very clear local objection from the adjacent villages.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Scheme from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the project further away from Isleham and Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set further back from Ferry Lane. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A has also been reduced. This will set the project further back from residential dwellings in the area. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W14 is being set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Further information on design changes to the Scheme since the statutory consultation can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Have you been to view the site and see the scale?	NO	The Applicant and members of the Applicant's consultant team have visited the site on many occasions to view the area and carry out assessments. The outputs of these assessments are available to view in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Does the scale of the project with its associated infrastructure – cables / concrete / batteries etc – not make it relatively inefficient in terms of the carbon footprint per unit of energy produced when compared to projects that are smaller and consequently closer to offtake?	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme. This identified and assessed Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. Based on the total energy generation and the lifecycle GHG emissions of 161,768 tCO ₂ e, the GHG intensity of the energy generated by the Scheme over its assessed lifetime is 6.87 grams of CO ₂ equivalent per kWh (gCO ₂ e/kWh). This compares favourably with fossil fuel electricity generation and is comparable with other low carbon fuels. Table 6-16 within Chapter 6: Climate Change of the PEI Report outlines energy intensity ranges of alternative forms of energy generation. Further information can be found within Chapter 6: Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	Both A and B sites will be of such a significant scale that just building one of the overall 4 proposed would be a massive blot on a landscape.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment..A suite of specialist reports have been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include a full landscape and visual impact assessment alongside a landscape character assessment that have been undertaken regarding the Scheme. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Taking into account the feedback from the statutory consultation and the results of the specialist surveys and studies a suite of landscape mitigation measures and design changes have been proposed to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. This has included the removal of some areas previously suggested for location of PV modules; the addition of 'set back' areas from field edges closest to human receptors and the introduction of a large amount of tree and grassland planting. Within the areas reserved for location of PV modules, the Applicant is proposing planting around and below the PV modules to further benefit biodiversity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	I understand the need and commitment of the government for solar power and I am in favour of renewable energy but this proposal is just too big.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Sunnica Energy Farm has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. The Applicant's approach to ensuring the benefit of the Sunnica Energy Farm as well as detailed assessments of the project's climate footprint is discussed within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in Chapter 6 - Climate Change.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The non-statutory public consultation centred around a Scheme being able to import and export up to 500MW of electricity. If the Scheme shows the ability to import and export MORE will the land required be reduced in accordance with the 500MW proposal?	NO	The Applicant recognises that at the non-Statutory consultation stage a figure of up to 500MW for the grid connection capacity was consulted upon. The output of the Sunnica Energy Farm in terms of installed power capacity will be determined post consent once the final design has been completed. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the non-Statutory and further following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The original acreage at the first consultation was 2,600 and it has now increased to 2,727 being larger than the first proposal.	NO	This is not correct. The Applicant reduced the area of the Scheme between the non-statutory and statutory consultations. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The Applicant consulted as required by the PA 2008 in respect of the Order limits presented in its DCO application. Approximately 70% of the land within the Order Limits is proposed to be used for PV modules and associated infrastructure, with the remainder used for embedded mitigation and planting. Within the areas reserved for PV modules, we are proposing planting around and below the solar arrays to further benefit biodiversity. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size following the formal consultation. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the Sunnica Energy Farm further away from Isleham and Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced following the Statutory consultation. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. The areas where the modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W13 and W14 have been removed from the project resulting in the solar development being set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10 and W11. Landscape treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate the impact on Kennett Garden Village. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The Scheme is significantly larger than other solar farms in the UK, which are on average 75-100 acres.	NO	There is a direct correlation between the amount of land required and the level of energy the Applicant would be able to produce if granted consent. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	All 3 proposed Battery storage unit compounds sites together, occupy a far larger area than suggested during the 2019 non-statutory consultation.	NO	The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the project design to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. The Applicant has revised the design including the BESS compound areas of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the non-statutory and further following the statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is described in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The evolution of the Scheme design is described in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The changes to the scheme presumably reflect the reluctance of one of the landowners to continue supporting the scheme and have led to additional land being sought.	NO	The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the project design including to the Order Limits boundary to reflect assessments conducted and respond to consultation responses received. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the non-statutory and further following the statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is described in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The evolution of the Scheme design is described in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	The question also has to be raised as to whether this is really the final scale of the proposal? The cable corridor would presumably allow further connections between Worlington and Burwell.	NO	The Applicant is seeking development consent for land only within the Order limits presented in its DCO application. The Applicant does not anticipate applying for any additional solar or battery energy storage development beyond this. The Applicant has submitted an updated project description as part of its DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Need	I do not believe it is appropriate for one community playing field in Freckenham to be surrounded by over 2,000 playing fields worth of glass and steel panels, fencing, flood lighting and batteries, equivalent to 2115 football pitches. The playing field is a little bit smaller in size than a football pitch.	YES	The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the project design including to the Order Limits boundary to reflect assessments conducted and respond to consultation responses received. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the non-statutory and further following the statutory consultation. These changes have included further setting back from Freckenham and routes between Freckenham and Isleham, and Freckenham and Worlington. In each case, areas within the Order limits that were proposed for solar development will now provide ecological enhancements. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The updates that took place on 07.11.2020 radically changed the format and volume of information presented prior to that date. We consider that these changes are in breach of the original Consultation Booklet delivered on or after the 22nd September. Surely these changes were not the result of webinars and questions from the public over 46 days. The information has fleshed out the framework of what went before which begs the question as to why this information was held back?	NO	The Applicant made minor changes to the red line boundary and extended the consultation 16 days to the 18 December 2020 to reflect this. This gave consultees 6 weeks to consult on the changes, which the Applicant considers sufficient. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process prior to the DCO submission being submitted. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. The PEI Report was published prior to the start of the statutory consultation and included details on a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	There is a lack of clarity around whether the Battery Electrical Storage Systems are indicative or form a definitive part of the scheme.	NO	The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. The Sunnica Energy Farm will confirm the energy storage capacity for the BESS as part of the detailed design that we will prepare if a Development Consent Order (DCO) is granted. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. It is important to note that the key design parameters that could cause environmental effects are fixed by the Applicant's DCO application and have been assessed within the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This ensures that the Applicant has assessed, and where required proposed mitigation for, the maximum environmental impact of its proposals. Battery energy storage technology is the subject of much innovation. It is therefore important that the Applicant is able to allow for flexibility within its DCO application to deliver a final design (subject to received development consent) that can take advantage of the latest developments in technology and therefore can maximise the benefits associated with BESS development. For this reason, it is not appropriate to fix the storage capacity at the consenting stage as doing so could risk limiting the potential benefits of the Scheme. The specifications of the area and location of the batteries were published within Chapter 3 (Scheme Description) of the PEI Report in

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			table 3-1 below section 3.3.4 and section 3.4.22 – 3.4.39. Should consent be granted, the Applicant will only be able to build the proposed scheme on the area identified for the batteries and within controlled parameters, such as height. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The extent and details of the BESS are not specified, beyond i) land area allocated for BESS compound and ii) a maximum cabin size. This fails to specify even an outer limit, since the density of cabins on the ground is not specified, only their individual footprints. You have not specified the energy storage capacity in MWh for each cabin.	NO	The PEI Report was published prior to the start of the statutory consultation and included details on a number of aspects of the Sunnica Energy Farm. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. It is important to note that the key design parameters that could cause environmental effects are fixed by the Applicant's DCO application and have been assessed within the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This ensures that the Applicant has assessed, and where required proposed mitigation for, the maximum environmental impact of its proposals. Battery energy storage technology is the subject of much innovation. It is therefore important that the Applicant is able to allow for flexibility within its DCO application to deliver a final design (subject to received development consent) that can take advantage of the latest developments in technology and therefore can maximise the benefits associated with BESS development. For this reason, it is not appropriate to fix the storage capacity at the consenting stage as doing so could risk limiting the potential benefits of the Scheme. The specifications of the area and location of the batteries were published within Chapter 3 (Scheme Description) of the PEI Report in table 3-1 below section 3.3.4 and section 3.4.22 – 3.4.39. Should consent be granted, the Applicant will only be able to build the proposed scheme on the area identified for the batteries and within controlled parameters, such as height. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The Cleeve Hill E A report contains 12 pages on the subject. Recently I asked Sunnica to advise me of the number of BESS containers on each of the 3 sites designated in their proposal and again as with the number of Solar Panels their response was they are unable to give these details.	NO	The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Sunnica Energy Farm cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Sunnica Energy Farm has been completed. The specifications of the area and location of the batteries were published within Chapter 3 (Scheme Description) of the PEI Report in table 3-1 below section 3.3.4 and section 3.4.22 – 3.4.39. Should consent be granted, the Applicant will only be able to build the proposed scheme on the area identified for the batteries and within controlled parameters, such as height. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The changes made to the site boundary are tokenistic as the planting is not sufficient.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. The changes to the site boundary have been informed by the consultation process and have reduced the extent of the Scheme. There are no PV modules proposed in proximity to Freckenham, via the removal of E07. In relation to Worlington, the PV modules have been offset from the village via the removal of PV modules from E11 and E23 following the consultation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A has been reduced with no PV modules in proximity to the B1085 from Chippenham, via the removal of W13 and W14 (shown in Figure 4-5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]). The set back of the Scheme has been increased from La Hogue Road, with additional new planting adjacent to the road. There is a substantial amount of planting across the Scheme, specifically around the boundaries of the land proposed for PV modules and associated structures, along with the retention of the existing vegetation where practicable. This extent of planting is considered able to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme, as well as provide additional opportunities for biodiversity and increasing the amount of vegetation cover. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	It is understood that this scheme will be the largest solar farm in Europe and accordingly every effort should be made to deliver an exemplary scheme that delivers a creative approach to renewable energy delivery in the English countryside.	NO	The Applicant considers the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. In addition, the impact is considered acceptable in the context of the importance and benefits that the Scheme will bring. This has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant has committed to delivering a biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is outlined in its Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], including in Chapter 8. Ecology and Nature Conservation. Not all of the land within the order limits will be used for solar infrastructure, with the remainder used for embedded mitigation and planting. Within the solar development, we are also proposing grassland planting between the PV modules to benefit biodiversity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Object to the monotonous layout of serried ranks of panels which pay no regard to the landscape and visual impacts of the industrialising effects of this layout.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. A suite of specialist reports have been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include a full landscape and visual impact assessment alongside a landscape character assessment that have been undertaken regarding the Scheme. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Taking into account the feedback from the PEIR and the results of the specialist surveys and studies a suite of landscape mitigation measures and design changes have been proposed to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. This has included the removal of some areas previously suggested for solar use; the addition of 'set back' areas from field edges closest to human receptors and the introduction of a large amount of tree and grassland planting. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The only underlying pattern seems to be to smear it across as many small established communities as possible	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment. The underlying pattern has been to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme via the Applicant undertaking a detailed analysis of the local landscape character (as set out in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) and responding to the consultation feedback. With reference to the Parameter Plans there are no PV modules proposed in proximity to Freckenham, via the removal of E07. In relation to Worlington, the PV modules have been offset from the village via the removal of PV modules from E11 and E23. These measures are considered to mitigate impacts to the local character. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The design and situation are very sympathetic to the local area.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	There are too many roads, paths, public footpaths, and streams criss-crossing the sites.	NO	An analysis of potential alternative locations for the Scheme was undertaken as included in Appendix 4A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is appropriate. A full environmental impact assessment has been conducted including the suite of specialist studies and demonstrates that the impacts from the site are appropriate. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction, including impacts to the users of public rights of way and in relation to watercourses.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	It is too industrial for the local area.	NO	We do not consider that the Scheme as presented is too industrial for the local area. An Alternative Sites Assessment has been submitted with the DCO Application in Appendix 4A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This, as well as the Alternatives chapter (Chapter 4 of the ES [EN010106/AP/6.1]) describes the process followed to consider alternative sites during the Scheme design development, and how the final Order limits were set. A suite of specialist reports have been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include a full landscape and visual impact assessment alongside a landscape character assessment that have been undertaken regarding the Scheme. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Taking into account the feedback from the PEIR and the results of the specialist surveys and studies a suite of landscape mitigation measures and design changes have been proposed to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. This has included the removal of some areas previously suggested for solar use; the addition of 'set back' areas from field edges closest to human receptors and the introduction of a large amount of tree and grassland planting. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	You have not committed to any specific design.	NO	The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Sunnica Energy Farm cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. The Applicant will confirm details of the elements of the Scheme as part of the detailed design that we will prepare if a Development Consent Order (DCO) is granted. Design parameters were published within Chapter 3 (Scheme Description) of the PEI Report in table 3-1. Should consent be granted, the Applicant will build within the controlled parameters. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The proposals are very good and forward thinking.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The sandwiching of La Hogue Farm is overbearing.	YES	The Applicant considers the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and has provided significant embedded mitigation. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in the Appendix 10I - Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. No landscaping and fencing will be created on existing bridleways or PRoW. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation which will further mitigate the visual impact of the Sunnica Energy Farm. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Landscaping treatments have been introduced along the W10, W11 and W12 boundary to further screen these parcels. There will be significant treatment on the eastern side of W15. Parcels W13 and W14 have both been removed from solar development. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	A unified single site closer to a national grid substation must be sought.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	A creative approach to design is required avoiding monotonous rows of panels. This could be through, for example, emulating field patterns or creating shapes and vistas that promote more visual interest.	NO	The design has reflected the field patterns to site the PV modules within existing vegetation structures. The alignment of the PV modules allows for operational requirements. The intention has been to reduce the visibility of the PV modules and associated structures via the siting of the PV modules and new planting, rather than allowing the PV modules to be visible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	A comprehensive review of the layout should be sought before the Environmental Statement stage is reached.	NO	The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process. The Applicant has continued to review the Sunnica Energy Farm design in response to comments received during the statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The opportunity to create vistas or eye-catching patterns has not been taken.	NO	The intention has been to reduce the visibility of the PV modules and associated structures via the siting of the PV modules and new planting, rather than allowing the PV modules to be visible. Furthermore, the Applicant has not proposed an eye-catching approach to the rows of PV modules as this would not be practicable for efficient maintenance protocols and land use within the Scheme. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Both the East sites (Site A especially) seem opportunistic and without an over-arching plan other than to acquire land.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process. The Applicant has continued to review the Sunnica Energy Farm design in response to comments received during the statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The splitting of Sunnica East into two smaller units was forced upon Sunnica due to the withdrawal of 800 acres of land by Richard Tuke at Freckenham.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process. The Applicant has continued to review the Sunnica Energy Farm design in response to comments received during the statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Site A is distant from connections and piecemeal in layout.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. From the Point of Connection at Burwell a 15km radius is considered by Sunnica Limited to be the maximum viable distance for the area of search based on cost estimates provided by their independent connection provider/contractor. In addition, the layout has been determined by size of individual field, topography and shading, all of which have contributed to the final layout of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Site B extends the industrialisation of the area well into high quality farming countryside close to Worlington.	NO	We do not consider that the Scheme as presented will industrialise the local area. A suite of specialist reports have been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include a full landscape and visual impact assessment alongside a landscape character assessment that have been undertaken regarding the Scheme. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation such that the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located s at Sunnica East Site B has also been extended further away from Worlington via the omission of development within parcels E11 and E23. The Scheme is reversible, the land will be available to be returned to agriculture once the decommissioning phase is completed. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	East Site B is monstrous and will significantly alter the landscape of the area.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Scheme from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the Scheme further away from Isleham and Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 and E18 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	East Site B would be best.	NO	This comment is noted

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	East Site B is too close to A11 where it passes the Worlington turn off.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the siting of Sunnica East site B is too close to the A11 where it passes the Worlington turn off. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. This sites the Sunnica Energy Farm further away from Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 and E18 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The Scheme does not make clear the use of section E23 and we request further information.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. Parcel E23 is no longer proposed to be built on and is now proposed as an embedded ecological offset. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	We request that E11 is scaled back further on the North and Eastern edges from properties along Freckenham Road, those at The Greens off Freckenham Road and those at Elevenways off Freckenham Road.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Why can't you move East Site B further back?	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 and E18 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	There are miles of unnecessary, unsightly fencing due to poor design.	NO	The Applicant considers the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and has provided significant embedded mitigation. The Applicant has assessed the potential impacts of the Sunnica Energy Farm details of this are set out in the Chapter 10 - Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has set out proposed outline landscaping plan details of which are available in the Appendix 10I - Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A description of the proposed fencing was outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the PEI Report. Examples of both types of fencing used can be found on Plate 3-11 and Plate 3-12 within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the PEI Report. The fencing proposed for the Scheme will consist of a 2m high deer fence.' Hedgerows are also proposed around areas of the site perimeter to further aid visual mitigation. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Use of open mesh fencing is preferable to close boarding or metal palisade-type fencing with sharp points on top.	NO	A description of the proposed fencing was outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the PEI Report. Examples of both types of fencing used can be found on Plate 3-11 and Plate 3-12 within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the PEI Report. The fencing proposed for the Scheme will consist of a 2m high deer fence. Hedgerows are also proposed around areas of the site perimeter to further aid visual mitigation. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Further expansion is clearly envisaged with the great areas of Fenland to the west and the north of Burwell with minimal existing buildings and population it would be possible to develop a compact national unit.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in the Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Four substations will raise the height of the installations.	NO	The Sunnica Energy Farm will include three substations at East Site A, East Site B and West Site A. This element will be up to 10m in height. The Applicant considers the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and has provided significant embedded mitigation. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping proposal within the Appendix 10I - Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The strategic planting is an improvement to the overall design.	NO	This comment is welcomed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	I specifically request provision of parks and walks, and an exhibition centre with viewing tower. I also request an exhibition centre to have maps, an explanation of the technologies involved, the archaeology, the build, the CO2 saved, power generated etc. This could be near the office area.	NO	The Applicant is not proposing to provide an educational facility onsite; however, an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8] has been submitted with the DCO. This plan which will outline training and educational provisions for the Scheme. This plan will outline skills training for Scheme employees (e.g. apprenticeships, on-the-job training) as well for the wider community benefits such as site visits, work placements, educational programmes, links with schools/colleges/universities for educational purpose. The Applicant is also proposing new permissive routes as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to improve the connectivity between villages. Where areas for mitigation are suggested, the Applicant intends these to boost biodiversity and retain the existing landscape character. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The size will create a depressing effect on the local populations as it is out of scale with the surroundings.	YES	The Applicant considers the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and has provided significant embedded mitigation. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping plan in the Appendix 10I - Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on and now form ECO2 and ECO3 as shown on Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. This sites the Sunnica Energy Farm further away from Isleham and Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B have both been reduced. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. W13, W14 and W16 (as shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES) have been removed from the Order limits with the result being that the Sunnica Energy Farm is set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at W15. Landscape treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	It is so large because it is so far from Burwell.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There is a direct correlation between the amount of land required and the level of energy the Applicant would be able to produce if granted consent. This in turn has an impact on the contribution that the Sunnica Energy Farm can make to the country's energy needs. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The site should be split into several smaller sites near Burwell.	NO	The criteria used for site selection was published during the statutory consultation under Chapter 4: Alternatives of the PEI Report, and can be found in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] in the Environmental Statement. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The panels are too close to the roads and there are paths dissecting the Scheme.	NO	The Applicant considers that the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to consider the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. The Applicant does not agree that the PV modules are too close to the roads or that those paths which cross the Sunnica Energy Farm are impacted negatively. The Applicant believes the Sunnica Energy Farm is compatible with the established character and pattern of land use locally. The Sunnica Energy Farm is set back from roads in particular parcel E11 has been removed from solar development in response to feedback from the Statutory Consultation. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in the Appendix 10I - Outline LEMP submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	This unthought out money spinner is like an aborted fetus dismembered with only the umbilical cord holding it together.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	You have not told us if the landowners are signed up yet so we can't know if this is going to be the area for the Scheme.	NO	The Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] show the limits of land within the Order limits on which it is proposed to develop PV modules, together with the land which would be used for screening, planting and other purposes. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits boundary to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The splitting of the site into two parcels is welcome and will reduce the visual impact	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The cumulative effect of all the proposed solar panels is greater than if constructed on one site.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant considers the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. Approximately 63% of the land within the order limits will be used for solar infrastructure, with the remainder used for embedded mitigation and planting. Within the solar development, Sunnica Energy Farm is also proposing planting around and below the solar arrays to benefit biodiversity. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in the Appendix 10I - Outline LEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The ad hoc approach to site selection has resulted in a series of poorly related greenfield sites of approximately 2700 acres which has a sprawling site perimeter that fails to relate successfully within the existing landscape fabric.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The criteria used for site selection was published during the statutory consultation under Chapter 4: Alternatives of the PEI Report. The Applicant has sought to maximise the utilisation of low grade, non-best and most versatile land in the siting of the site. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant recognises that the local landscape is important and that many local people attach significant value to it. The Applicant considers the Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. Sunnica Energy Farm is proposing extensive offsets and planting, this will establish over time to soften and screen views into the site. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in the Appendix 10I - Outline LEMP submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The design seems poorly planned and inefficient.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Build the battery storage elsewhere without PV so it can be more easily sited.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The battery storage element provides grid balancing services by allowing excess electricity generated from the PV modules, or imported from the grid, to be stored in batteries Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The expansion of Burwell substation seems a substantial coming on the back of 49.9 MGW approved in 2018. If this station is increased again then the cabling should be a direct to grid system and negate battery storage on the proposed East/West A & B sites.	NO	The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The solar stations and battery energy storage systems are white in colour and highly effective mitigation must be achieved. Their exterior surfaces could be painted green however, if doing so would increase the cooling requirement, they could remain white but be surrounded by tall dark green panel fencing.	NO	The BESS units and solar stations will be externally finished in keeping with the prevailing surrounding environment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The new transformer should be housed on land owned by the National Grid.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension. The substation will need to be located in the immediate vicinity of the Burwell National Grid Substation and sited as to be compatible with National Grid's existing operations at the site. One of those options is on land owned by National Grid.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The North West site should be chosen for extending the Burwell substation.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The substation will need to be located in the immediate vicinity of the Burwell National Grid Substation and sited as to be compatible with National Grid's existing operations at the site. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Location of new transformer station by Weirs Drove is best site.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The substation will need to be located in the immediate vicinity of the Burwell National Grid Substation and sited as to be compatible with National Grid's existing operations at the site. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The availability of easy access was fortuitous wasn't it! Questions must be asked!	NO	The Applicant has considered a number of options for accessing the sites and has developed its access proposals through consultation with the local highways authorities while having regard to the responses received through the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The substation should not be extended further.	NO	The Burwell National Grid Substation needs to be extended to facilitate the Scheme. The two options proposed need to be located close to the existing substation for technical reasons. Details on the two options are provided in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Option 1 for the substation is not appropriate.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Option 1 is likely to be the least visually intrusive site for a new transformer.	NO	At Burwell National Grid Substation Extension, there would be new boundary woodland planting along the eastern edge of Option 1 and the western edge of Option 2. There would also be replacement planting along the Newnham Drove where the vegetation is to be removed for cable route construction. These elements are set out in the Landscape Masterplan proposals, in Figures 10-14a-f of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The options for the location of the Burwell National Grid Substation Extension are more constrained, as they have to be in proximity to the existing Burwell Substation. Significant effects are anticipated in year 1 of operation, before planting has had time to establish and mature, however the effects are assessed to be reduced by year 15 of operation, once planting has matured to screen the substations. The assessment on landscape and visual effects is provided in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Option 1 will have a detrimental impact on the amenity value of Weirs Drove.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Could the extension not be pushed closer to the existing substation?	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Option 1 should not be chosen due to the noise.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension. As discussed in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] Option 1 for the Burwell National Grid Substation Extension is within National Grid land ownership to the east of the existing substation, adjacent to Weirs Drove, approximately 200m west of Burwell and 100m west from assessment receptor R1, which has been assessed as a worst-case scenario. The Option 2 location is to the north of the existing substation approximately 450m from Burwell, such that operational noise levels will be lower at human receptors compared to the preferred location. Predicted rating levels of operational infrastructure at receptors R3 to R12 are below the existing background levels, other than at R9 where rating levels are equal to the background level during the early morning/late evening/night period. This indicates a low magnitude impact at R9 and a very low magnitude impact at R3 to R8 and R10 to R12. For receptors of high sensitivity, this equates to a negligible to minor adverse effect, which is not significant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Option 3 is preferable as it is screened from the road and is further away from Burwell.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Batteries should be sited at Option 3, away from Newnham Drive so users of the cycleway are not impacted.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension. For the purpose of optimal design and to minimise the need for additional cabling and transformers, the Applicant is proposing to locate the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) close to on-site transformers at the PV module sites and not at the Burwell Substation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	There are houses very close to the existing substation at Burwell and it may be very difficult to get local planning permission to get any extension.	NO	As the Scheme has a generating capacity over 50MW it is classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and will be determined by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy rather than through the local planning system. The environmental effects of both options for the National Grid Burwell Substation Extension are assessed in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] accompanying the DCO Application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The Burwell extensions plans are on agricultural fields which is a change to the original consultation.	NO	The Applicant has continued to revise the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the non-statutory and Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This sets out that the Applicant continues to explore two potential options for the location of the National Grid substation extension. Both of these areas identified for Burwell National Grid substation extension are located on agricultural fields. Only one of the options, will be used. The impact is considered acceptable in the context of the importance and benefits that the Scheme will bring. This has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. The Applicant recognises that is the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Preferable to the Sunnica East sites as they are more open.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	A redesign to a project around the size of the area W06-W12 could potentially be considered as it looks to be away from residential areas and water courses.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced. The areas where the PV modules and W13, W14 and W16 have been removed from the Sunnica Energy Farm with the result being to set it back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Landscape treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Site A: would be willing to review a proposal for a solar panel farm of scale extending potentially across W05/06/07/08/09/10/11/12 and W17 - if this were to be a direct to grid Scheme.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm from residential dwellings in the area. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W13 and W14 have been removed from solar development with the effect being to set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Landscape treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	W14 is inappropriately close to residential dwellings and a farm shop.	YES	W14, as well as W13 and W16, has now been removed from the Sunnica Energy Farm. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	W02 and W03 should be removed from the Scheme.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced. This will set back the Sunnica Energy Farm back from residential dwellings in the area. Areas of W02, and W03 will be used for native grassland and wetland planting. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Sunnica West Site B looks either opportunistic or a stake in the ground for further expansion which has not been mentioned.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site B has been reduced. Significant areas of W01 and W02 are allocated for ecological mitigation. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Sunnica West Site B should not be in the Scheme at all as it takes away outdoor areas providing quality of life to a small hamlet already affected by the A142.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. Significant areas of W01 and W02 are allocated for ecological mitigation. This will set back the Scheme from residential dwellings in the area. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The installation section of the consultation booklet refers to site levelling, piling for the panels and trenching. Can you please supply details on what the area and extent of levelling are, what the piling for the panel installation entails and is, and what area of trenching there will be?	NO	There will be an element of ground levelling required for construction, but this will be localised and will not be noticeable. If piling is required, piles to a maximum depth of 3.5m would be used. The area and extent of levelling and the area of trenching will be identified prior to construction following geotechnical surveys. Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides further details on the construction activities. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Appendix 16C: Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	During construction, access is to be through farmland just south of The Lodge, 45 Newmarket Road. This route has previously been used by thieves to gain access to the Abbey farm buildings causing considerable damage and loss of equipment.	NO	The Applicant will implement precautionary working methods during construction across the entire Scheme. This includes establishing a perimeter security fence around the Scheme early in the construction phase to secure the Site. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Further details on the security of the Scheme during operation can be found in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	There will be no respite from the noise and traffic for up to 2 years.	NO	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP. A Framework CEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Noise impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant as is set out in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Construction of the West Sites will be less disruptive as they are further from human habitation.	NO	This comment is noted. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Can Sunnica guarantee that washing on our washing line will not ever have dust on it during the construction process?	NO	The Applicant has assessed the risk of dust and particulate matter impacts during construction in Chapter 14 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and concludes that the impacts of construction on local air quality are not significant. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The landscape is flat so dust from construction and vehicles travels great distances.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the risk of dust and particulate matter impacts during construction in Chapter 14 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and concludes that the impacts of construction on local air quality are not significant. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	How will you make the construction green?	NO	A number of embedded mitigation measures to ensure greenhouse gas emissions are minimised during construction have been proposed in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and have been included within the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Chapter 6 concludes a minor adverse effect (not significant) on greenhouse gas emissions from construction; annual emissions from the construction of the Scheme do not contribute to equal to or more than 1% of the annualised 4th carbon budget. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects on other environmental receptors during construction across the entire Scheme. Mitigation measures to be adopted during construction are detailed within each of the technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C [EN010106/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The benefits of Sunnica will outweigh the CO2 emissions from construction	NO	The Applicant agrees with the comment. Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] concluded that "the renewable energy generation of the Scheme overall is considered to have a major beneficial effect on the climate".

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	I object strongly to the construction of East A and B so near to local villages, especially Freckenham, Worlington and Barton Mills	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B has been reduced in size. No PV modules will be in proximity of Freckenham, as development is to the east of Beck Road. No PV modules will be in proximity to Barton Mill. In respect of Worlington, parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the PV modules further away from Worlington. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Order Limits to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. In this case, the Scheme design evolved between the non-statutory and statutory consultations and has been amended again following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The parameter plans have been updated and are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 (parameter plans) of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Therefore the Applicant has retained reference to the parameter plans to assist understanding with this consultation response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Don't build it.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	There will be 1260 workers, heavy plant machinery and goods vehicles coming in and out of our small villages from 7am-7pm, 6 days a week.	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (presented in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) and a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. Staff will be required to travel outside of the network peak hours and arrive at one of the two centralised car parks between 0600-0700 and depart between 1900-2000.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	I am not satisfied that the Considerate Constructors Scheme is a robust enough standard to ensure that a project of this size or appropriate for managing and reducing the environmental impacts arising – especially in relation to the operational impacts from energy and waste, water.	NO	The Considerate Constructors Scheme will assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Scheme by employing best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. In addition, the Applicant has included a Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Framework CTMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] to manage potential impacts during construction as part of its DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The Health and Safety specification and briefing for all attending the site should include a section covering use of routes or areas by equestrians as below: All members of the construction and operational work force and visitors should be made aware of the equestrian routes or areas affected by the site. If a banksman is employed to control vehicle movements and activities they should be fully briefed about the possibility of horses being in the area and the necessary actions to be taken for the safety of horse and rider or driver and others in the vicinity. Warning notices should be displayed in advance of the site describing the hazards for both equestrians and the construction site workers or visitors and requesting the co-operation of all.	YES	The Applicant will have regard to this guidance and it is included in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The local infrastructure is not capable of supporting construction work of this scale	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP in Appendix 13C [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. This establishes measures that will manage the volume of HGV and staff traffic, and so far as reasonably practicable the impacts for the local community. The Applicant is proposing to create contained construction compounds within the sites which will contain offices, mobile welfare units, canteens, and parking areas. This will further reduce the pressure on existing infrastructure and services. This has been outlined in the Scheme Description within the ES: Chapter 3 [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	There will be light pollution during construction.	NO	Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This includes controls on lighting and the adoption of mitigation principles so as to minimise artificial light spill from the Scheme during construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Any lights used during the construction phase may impact on nocturnal animals and protected species and mitigation measures should be implemented.	NO	Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This includes controls on lighting and the adoption of mitigation principles so as to minimise artificial light spill from the Scheme during construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	How will residents be compensated for the noise pollution from the piling process?	NO	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Noise impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. This is set out in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. As such, it is not anticipated that significant levels of noise would be experienced. .

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The relentless construction noise coming from Burwell during piling has been unbearable- please stop all weekend work on sites.	NO	The Applicant has not commenced construction work at Burwell.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Any noise pollution should not affect the right of quiet enjoyment of the golf course.	NO	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP. Noise impacts from construction, operation and decommissioning works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. This is set out in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Piling noise during construction should be mitigated and working hours should be in line with environmental health guidelines.	NO	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP. Noise impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. This is outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant will adopt the Considerate Constructors Scheme to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Scheme and will employ best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Noise and vibration during construction will have a negative impact on the Fordham Abbey Estate. The peaceful ambience of this site will be lost, resulting in an expected loss of visitors and income.	NO	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP. Noise and vibration impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. This is outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The landscape is flat so noise travels clearly and quickly.	NO	The Applicant has provided additional information on its methodology for assessing the construction and operational noise impacts of the Scheme within Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Information relating to the development of construction and operational noise models are presented in Appendix 11D and 11E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Sudden movement or noises of machinery should be avoided where horses are within range. Operators must be able to shut off machinery or to stop movement and noise while horses pass until they are 20m past.	NO	A Framework CEMP, Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This document has provisions for the safety of horses, including, requiring all members of the construction and operational work force and visitors to be made aware of the equestrian routes or areas affected by the site. Staff will be fully briefed about the possibility of horses being in the area and the necessary actions to be taken for the safety of horse and rider in the vicinity of the Scheme. Warning notices would be displayed in advance of the site describing the hazards for both equestrians and the construction site workers or visitors and requesting the co-operation of all.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	If it is not possible for activity to be halted, staff should be at the location to warn approaching equestrians as appropriate.	NO	A Framework CEMP, Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This document has provisions for the safety of horses, including, requiring all members of the construction and operational work force and visitors to be made aware of the equestrian routes or areas affected by the site. Staff will be fully briefed about the possibility of horses being in the area and the necessary actions to be taken for the safety of horse and rider in the vicinity of the Scheme. Warning notices would be displayed in advance of the site describing the hazards for both equestrians and the construction site workers or visitors and requesting the co-operation of all.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	If a horse appears distressed or an equestrian appears to be struggling for control, or shouts, all movement and noise should cease immediately to avoid escalating the situation.	NO	A Framework CEMP, Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This document has provisions for the safety of horses, including, requiring all members of the construction and operational work force and visitors to be made aware of the equestrian routes or areas affected by the site. Staff will be fully briefed about the possibility of horses being in the area and the necessary actions to be taken for the safety of horse and rider in the vicinity of the Scheme. Warning notices would be displayed in advance of the site describing the hazards for both equestrians and the construction site workers or visitors and requesting the co-operation of all.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Why can't a modern piler that can be silenced be used instead?	NO	The Applicant will be using the industry standard piler during the construction period. While there will be some noise resulting from the piler this has been assessed and deemed not to be significant. Further information can be found within the Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has conducted construction and operational noise modelling to assess the potential impacts on nearby receptors. Noise impacts from construction and operation are predicted to be negligible and not significant. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. Further details are set out within the Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The increase in traffic and HGVs as a result of the construction will cause pollution in the area	NO	The Applicant has assessed the risk of dust and particulate matter impacts during construction in Chapter 14 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which concludes that the impacts of construction on local air quality are not significant. Mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts from construction traffic have been incorporated into Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	How close to the estimate of 2 years is feasible?	NO	The current expectation is that site preparation, construction and commissioning of the Sunnica Energy Farm will take approximately 24 months. This represents a 'worst-case' scenario to allow impacts to be fully assessed and mitigated. Further details regarding the construction process are set out within the Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	We all know projects on this scale always overrun so it potentially means chaos for much longer.	NO	The current expectation is that site preparation, construction and commissioning of the Scheme will take approximately 24 months. This represents a 'worst-case' scenario to allow impacts to be fully assessed and mitigated. Further details regarding the construction process are set out within the Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	How will waste from the site during construction be dealt with? Burwell saw lots of waste along the routes used by construction traffic.	NO	As part of the embedded mitigation proposed by the Applicant, a Framework CEMP has been submitted with the DCO in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will be secured through the DCO application and outlines the ways in which waste will be managed during construction. A Construction Resource Management Plan (CRMP) will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction. This will provide information on measures to control and manage waste on-site. All waste to be removed from the Order limits will be undertaken by fully licensed waste carriers and taken to licensed waste facilities.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	The proposed working hours during construction are too long.	NO	Construction working hours on the Sunnica Energy Farm will run from Monday-Saturday 7am-7pm. Where on-site works are conducted outside of core working hours they will comply with restrictions outlined in the Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. and any other restrictions agreed with relevant planning authorities. The Applicant recognises that construction can be disruptive and will adopt the Considerate Constructors Scheme to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Scheme. The Applicant will employ best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This will be outlined in the Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Aren't residents entitled to peaceful weekends without construction impacts?	NO	Construction working hours on Sunnica Energy Farm will run from Monday-Saturday 7am-7pm. Where on-site works are conducted outside of core working hours they will comply with restrictions outlined in the Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and any other restrictions agreed with relevant planning authorities. It is important to note that the construction programme details construction activity across the entire Sunnica Energy Farm. Therefore, activity will not be continuous at any one receptor. The Applicant recognises that construction can be disruptive and will adopt the Considerate Constructors Scheme to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant will employ best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Sunnica Energy Farm. This will be outlined in the Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Why do Saturdays have to be worked?	NO	It is important to note that the construction programme details construction activity across the entire Sunnica Energy Farm. Therefore, activity will not be continuous at any one receptor. The Applicant recognises that construction can be disruptive and will adopt the Considerate Constructors Scheme to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant will employ best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This will be outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	I agree with the idea in the consultation documents to define "core construction hours." Those hours should be Monday-Friday 0830-1730, so as to limit excess noise to conventional working times.	NO	Construction working hours on Site will run from Monday-Saturday 7am-7pm. Where on-site works are conducted outside of core working hours they will comply with restrictions outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement and any other restrictions agreed with relevant planning authorities. The Applicant recognises that construction can be disruptive and will adopt the Considerate Constructors Scheme to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant will employ best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Sunnica Energy Farm. This will be outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Ensure 24/7 working hours to expedite disruption.	NO	Construction working hours on Site will run from Monday-Saturday 7am-7pm. Where on-site works are conducted outside of core working hours they will comply with restrictions outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement and any other restrictions agreed with relevant planning authorities. The Applicant recognises that construction can be disruptive and will adopt the Considerate Constructors Scheme to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Sunnica Energy Farm. The Applicant will employ best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Sunnica Energy Farm in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	It may be that a planning condition ensuring that construction works in proximity of Snailwell Gallops do not commence until after 10am would help mitigate impact on the Godolphin.	NO	The Snailwell Gallops have been engaged throughout the design process. It has been agreed that construction works will start no earlier than 10am in areas in close proximity to the Snailwell Gallops. This is reflected in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement. Construction working hours on the remainder of the Scheme will run from Monday-Saturday 7am-7pm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	Our homes will be affected by vibrations during construction.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impact of vibration caused by construction on residential receptors at both sites. No significant effects were found due to construction works vibration. This is set out in Table 11-21 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Construction	We will see the construction and its results every day, in every direction, whatever we do and wherever we go, as your Environmental Landscape Viewpoint map makes clear.	NO	The Landscape Viewpoint map does not suggest whether construction activity will be visible, it only provides the location of where the landscape and visual impact assessment (Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) has identified a representative view to assess. The Applicant's prediction of the landscape and visual effects is set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1] and sets out the relevant mitigation to address the likely impacts and effects. The Scheme design has therefore been informed by the landscape and visual impact and the Scheme therefore does give weight to this aspect of the environmental assessment. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] should be referred to for further information.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	I object to the 100-metre width for every 1.6 metre of cable dug.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The working width of the cable route corridor will be approximately 30m, aside from in specific areas where specific pinch points, or lack of survey data mean that the potential cable corridor working width may need to be up to 100m. This includes the cable route trench itself, which will be approximately up to 3.5m, and the space either side required for machinery and storage of materials during excavation, cable laying, and infilling. Currently the Order Limits shows a maximum width of the cable corridor of 100m in some places. However, it has been narrowed in other places. The additional width in order to allow for unforeseen obstacles that will need to be avoided (e.g. buried archaeology identified through geophysics surveys), but in reality the width of disturbed land will be narrower in most places.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	How will the cable be laid? Will it be boring or be digging?	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The cable route corridor will need to cross a range of existing infrastructure. Open cut trenching will be primarily utilised for crossings. Trenchless techniques, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods will be undertaken where the EIA or design concludes the need for an alternative to open trenching. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. This is outlined in the in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	If cabling is laid through digging, how will the railway and Fordham to Burwell Road be crossed?	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the worst case has been assumed and assessed for each environmental discipline. The cable route corridor will need to cross a range of existing infrastructure. Open cut trenching will be primarily utilised for crossings. Trenchless techniques, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods will be undertaken where the EIA or design concludes the need for an alternative to open trenching. The Network Rail crossing is one of those where trenchless techniques will need to be used. Roads will typically use trenched techniques aside from larger roads such as the A142 and the A11 where trenchless techniques will be used. If the Burwell Road is to be crossed it will likely be via trenching techniques. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. This is outlined in the in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	As the cable route will cross the A142, railway and Fordham FP1 in quick succession, it may be possible to thrust bore, rather than seriously disrupt traffic.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The cable route corridor will need to cross a range of existing infrastructure. Open cut trenching will be primarily utilised for crossings. Trenchless techniques, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods will be undertaken where the EIA or design concludes the need for an alternative to open trenching. The Network Rail and A142 crossing is one of those where trenchless techniques will need to be used to seek to minimise disruption to traffic. Roads will typically use trenched techniques aside from larger roads such as the A142 and the A11 where trenchless techniques will be used. It is not clear what is meant by Fordham FP1. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. This will be outlined in the in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	New forms of energy generation should enhance the development, not rip up land to install cabling and infrastructure.	NO	The cable route will run underground and the effects during construction will be temporary. The cable route will be constructed in sequential sections, so areas of land will only be affected for a limited time before it is backfilled. It will not be visible during operation. The cable route will need to cross a range of existing infrastructure. Open cut trenching will be primarily utilised for crossings. However, trenchless techniques, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods will be undertaken at 23 locations across the site to reduce the potential environmental impact of the scheme, further detail can be found in Table 3-2 of Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	I have no problem with this essential work of laying cables.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Double check the coordinates recorded for cable positions, so no one hits one in future.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	There is no confirmed information on cable route, dimensions of cables, depth and method of burial, number of joints, type, cost and size of renovations at Burwell.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This includes confirmation on the cable route, and maximum dimensions of the cable route trenching, jointing bays. The two options for the National Grid substation extension are also elaborated in this Chapter 3. The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Sunnica Energy Farm cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Sunnica Energy Farm has been completed. The Applicant will confirm details of the elements of the Sunnica Energy Farm as part of the detailed design that we will prepare if a Development Consent Order (DCO) is granted. Should consent be granted, the Applicant will build within the controlled parameters set out in the DCO. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Cable laying would leave a massive scar on the countryside which would take several years to repair.	NO	The trenches for the cable laying will be backfilled with existing material to match the existing ground levels and in winter appear similar to agricultural fields. Any loss of vegetation will be replanted such that the cable laying will not result in a 'massive scar', nor will it take several years to repair. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] predicts that there will not be significant adverse effects from the cable routes, once implemented.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Can you guarantee that power and energy will not be lost and seep into the ground through the long length of cables to Burwell.	NO	The Applicant cannot guarantee that power and energy will not be lost and seep into the ground through the cables along the cable route corridor that joins both Sunnica West and Sunnica East to the National Grid substation extension at Burwell. This is because all cables have energy losses. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This includes confirmation on the cable route, and maximum dimensions of the cable route trenching, jointing bays. The two options for the National Grid substation extension are also elaborated in this Chapter 3.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The length of the cable route creates the need for local substations at each of the proposed sites. These pose their own risks with the transformers required to increase the voltage up to the stated 132Kv for transmission of power and to cover the significant voltage drop that will be experienced over this distance.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. The need for the local substations at each of the proposed sites is not linked to the length of the cable route. The need for three substations is linked to the layout of the site distributed across four sites. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This includes confirmation on the cable route, and maximum dimensions of the cable route trenching, jointing bays. The two options for the National Grid substation extension are also elaborated in this Chapter 3. Within the Scheme design outlined in Chapter 3, a number of safety features are designed in. This includes, in the event that outdoor transformers are used, they will feature a secure wire mesh fence to comply with the relevant safety standards. The Applicant therefore does not consider that the three substations pose a significant additional risk.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	It begs the question is the huge expanse of panels over such a wide area of countryside amounting to 1845 acres required to offset the inefficiency of the excess cabling above 5km.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The Applicant is proposing to install PV modules over a maximum area of 621 hectares (approximately 1534 acres). The Applicant does not consider the proposed Scheme's cabling to be 'excess' nor does it consider it to be 'inefficient'. The connection is required to facilitate a project of this scale while minimising the use of agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile'. The Applicant has set out its rationale for bringing forward a Scheme of this scale within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of its DCO application. Within section 9.3 of the Statement of Need, the Applicant sets out the importance of scale in solar development. This is because it brings greater decarbonisation and economic benefits when compared to a number of smaller, independent schemes comprising an equivalent generating capacity. The Sunnica Energy Farm has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. The Applicant's approach to ensuring the benefit of the Sunnica Energy Farm as well as detailed assessments of the Sunnica Energy Farm's climate footprint is discussed within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in Chapter 6.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Sunnica have confirmed that if the owners of the land where the cables will be laid object, they will be compulsory purchased which is absolutely disgusting.	NO	The Applicant has actively engaged all landowners and will continue to do so to reach voluntary agreements. Compulsory purchase powers will only be utilised where agreement is not able to be reached. Justification for these powers is set out in the Statement of Reasons.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	All new cables should be laid in agricultural land to minimise disruption to travel if the application is successful.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The cable corridor has been directed across open countryside and agricultural land. Where existing infrastructure such as roads and watercourses need crossing, trenchless techniques, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods will be undertaken where the EIA or design concludes the need for an alternative to open trenching to minimise disruption.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The ES report for Cleve Hill gives a search radius for potential sites of 5km, beyond which a grid connection becomes uneconomic. This applies equally to the Sunnica proposal and therefore we disagree with your plans for the planned cable route.	NO	A search radius of 15km was applied around Burwell Substation and this is considered to be economic for this Scheme. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	We have concerns with regards another potential high-powered cable, Sunnica propose when connecting to the National grid and extending the Burwell sub-station, crossing (either below or above) the high-power cable, laid from Burwell sub-Station to Mildenhall in 2018/19.	NO	The Applicant will have regard to all existing infrastructure during the cable laying process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The upkeep of the cables will cause disruption throughout the operation lifetime.	NO	Along the cable route, operational activity will consist of routine inspections (schedule to be determined) and any reactive maintenance such as where a cable has been damaged.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	It would also be appropriate to divulge the cost of the Smith Bros contract and who is financing this prior to receiving planning consent.	NO	The Applicant does not consider that this information was relevant or needed to allow meaningful consultation. Therefore, the Applicant does not deem it appropriate to divulge the cost of the Smith Bros contract. With regards the funding of the project a Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] has been submitted with the DCO application. This provides details about how the funding will be made available for the project.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	All cabling should be underground.	NO	Cabling will be above ground level between the PV modules. These will be fixed to the mounting structure along the row of racks. Cabling between the PV modules and inverters and between the individual sites will be buried within underground trenches. A Scheme description has been included in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Underground cables may cause greater disruption and environmental damage during installation.	NO	The Applicant has proposed to use underground cabling to ensure no effects from the cable route within the established landscape character. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects prior to and during construction. As part of the embedded mitigation proposed by the Applicant, a Framework CEMP (CEMP) has been submitted with the DCO in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	If cables are overground, will pylons be an eyesore?	NO	The Applicant is not proposing to use overground cables, not pylons. Cables would be below ground. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Underground cables may produce more emissions of CO2 due to construction activities.	NO	The Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment, undertaken as part of the Climate Change assessment and presented in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], has included the construction activities required to install underground cabling in the calculations of greenhouse gas emissions produced during construction. Minor adverse effects (not significant) on the global climate from greenhouse gas emissions has been assessed. An alternative to underground cabling (i.e. overground cabling) has not been considered, as this would introduce additional effects on the local landscape character and views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Underground cables are less visually intrusive.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	There are already a number of HV pylons crossing the countryside towards the Burwell station that a few more would not be a big deal.	NO	The Applicant is not proposing to use overground cabling as part as the Scheme. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Laying the cable route will cause noise pollution.	NO	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP. The Applicant will develop a construction noise monitoring scheme as part of the Section 61 consent prior to the commencement of construction works. Noise and vibration impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. This is set out in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	What effects will electrical radiation from the cables have on the area?	NO	All items carrying some form of electrical voltage or current are subject to electric and magnetic fields. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on the recommendation of the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England was consulted at this stage and raised no concerns.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Laying the cable route will cause delay to emergency vehicles which will cause lives to be lost.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has included a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application which will minimise the impacts on the local road network and community from construction activities, including in relation to cable laying.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Laying the cable route will cause danger to pedestrians.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has included a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application which will minimise the impacts on the local road network and community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The air pollution caused by machinery and dust disturbance will affect residents.	NO	Chapter 14: Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has shown that the impacts of construction on local air quality are not significant. The Applicant has outlined mitigation measures in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] that it will implement to reduce impacts from dust following a Dust Risk Assessment. Specific mitigation measures for each construction phase activity were outlined in Table 14.8 in Chapter 14: Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The cable crosses rivers, hedgerows and wildlife corridors which will destroy wildlife habitats.	NO	The cable route will need to cross a range of existing infrastructure. Open cut trenching will be primarily utilised for crossings. Trenchless techniques, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods will be undertaken where the EIA or design concludes the need for an alternative to open trenching. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. These measures are outlined in the Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Will underground cables pass through woodland at Wildtracks?	NO	The cabling will pass to the west of the Wildtracks site. The cable route will cross the B1085 immediately to the west of the belt of trees at the western edge of the Wildtracks site and will traverse through the fields to the north with aim to avoid the woodland blocks. The planned route for the cable corridor was available during the statutory consultation under Figure 1-2 of the PEI Report. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The trenching will cause damage to roads, fields and rivers during installation.	NO	The cable route will need to cross a range of existing infrastructure, agricultural fields and water bodies. Open cut trenching will be primarily utilised for crossings. Trenchless techniques, such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moiling methods will be undertaken where the EIA or design concludes the need for an alternative to open trenching. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. These will be outlined in the Appendix 16C - Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	Can you please explain the angled bends in the cable route from Sunnica East Site A to Sunnica East Site B? Luke Murray confirmed in a webinar that sharp bends are impracticable to negotiate when laying cables.	NO	Where possible the cable route corridor will avoid sharp bends for engineering reasons. The cable route corridor between Sunnica East Site A and Sunnica East Site B has been chosen to enable as smooth a cable corridor as possible while avoiding cutting through the middle of agricultural fields where possible and also avoiding impacting on sensitive ecological constraints such as tree belts of hedgerows where possible. The cable route corridor is subject to an iterative design process, and the final optimal cable route will be determined to respond to identified constraints. These include physical, ecological, cultural heritage and human interactions, technical engineering, legal and commercial considerations. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The proposed route will disrupt our lives.	NO	Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects on human and environmental receptors during construction. A Framework CEMP has been submitted with the DCO in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. In addition, the Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP as part of its DCO application in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which stipulates measures required to minimise the impacts on the local road network and community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	The proposed cable presumably goes from East Site A underneath the four cross bridge but then across the B1102 between Worlington and Freckenham. As a high-powered electric cable has only last year been laid along that same road what are the dangers of laying one high power electricity cable over another?	NO	The Applicant will have regard to all existing infrastructure during the cable laying process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Cable route	How long would the laying of the cables take?	NO	Preliminary information about construction timelines was included as part of our PEI Report under Chapter 3: Scheme Description under section 3.6. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] A construction programme of approximately 24 months will be achieved if the Scheme was built in one continuous phase. This has been assessed within the PEI Report, as it is considered to be a worst case in terms environmental effects. The final programme will be dependent on the final Sunnica Energy Farm design and potential environmental constraints on the timing of construction activities. More details including surrounding the anticipated timescales of construction is outlined in the in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] set out in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement. The construction of the cable route corridor will be undertaken in phases of approximately 4 months for each section. Boring, micro-tunnelling or moling sections will take between 8 and 12 weeks to construct.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The ecological assessment has not been fully completed at this stage including the cable routes.	NO	The PEI Report was published at statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme and a preliminary assessment of its effects. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further work prior to submitting the DCO application which includes a full Environmental Statement. Further information relating to ecological assessment is included within Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the application to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	It is not possible to understand whether the consultants have actually undertaken a true, full, assessment of the site.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake EIA on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice and expertise. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following DCO submission. Members of the local community will be able to comment upon them if the application is accepted by the Secretary of State for examination (through its relevant representation) and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the application to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	We recognise that this consultation represents the sharing of the preliminary results prior to the submission of the Environmental Statement in due course, we are disappointed that the information supplied within the PEIR is not more comprehensive.	NO	The Applicant considers that it has provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback to the consultation. The PEI Report was published at statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme and a preliminary assessment of its effects. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the application to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The Ecology Chapter of the PEIR indicates that the approach to evaluation of impact conforms to CIEEM guidelines (2018) there appears to be a departure from this standard approach and the preliminary impact assessment, as presented, does not appear to follow CIEEM (2018) standards. Consequently, it is extremely difficult to currently assess and comment in detail on scale and magnitude of impacts.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake EIA on its behalf. The findings are based upon industry best practice. All wildlife and habitat surveys met appropriate guidelines, including CIEEM guidelines and the methodology used to undertake the ecology assessment are outlined in Chapter of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The baseline (Paras 8.6.10 and following, Chapter 8) is not the same for all stages of the development. That for the decommissioning in 2065 is not that current in 2022 but is a baseline following the mitigation and compensation that has taken place over 43 years to allow the development to proceed.	NO	The EIA process requires an assessment of the Scheme against the current baseline, and the future baseline. This has been consistently assessed within all technical chapters within the Environmental Statement. It is acknowledged that the baseline may be different at decommissioning and therefore, a Framework Decommissioning Environment Management Plan (DEMP) has been submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This will be updated and finalised prior to decommissioning to ensure that any impacts resulting from the decommissioning phase are adequately mitigated. It is proposed that ecologically enhanced areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	No references are given to suggest that the scientific literature has been assessed to verify any statements made and to identify where there are matters of uncertainty.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. AECOM specialists are experienced professionals in their technical field and have based their statements and assessments on the most up to date scientific literature. All references are provided within each chapter. A Statement of Competence has been submitted in Appendix 1C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which details the experience of each of the technical leads for the disciplines that contributed to the EIA.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	A number of matters remain to be considered, including, but not exclusively, the attraction of panels to birds.	NO	The Applicant has considered the effects of PV modules and associated infrastructure in response to comments received after submission of the Scoping Report. The Scheme will not create habitat that will attract significant numbers of flocking birds that may pose a strike risk for aviation. The site also is not on a path connecting areas supporting significant numbers of birds that pose a risk to aviation, e.g., waterbirds. It is considered highly unlikely that the Scheme would have any effect on the numbers and frequency of bird flights overhead. This is set out in Chapter 8: Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Section 8.6 of this chapter which sets out ornithological baseline conditions and concludes no significant effects to birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Appendix 8b: Flora Survey Report provides the location of U1 acid grassland (Habitat of Principal Importance) in Sunnica East Site B and describes this as being of County Importance. It also notes that these grasslands are all in the same locality, including the Locally Designated Site – Worlington Heath CWS - and are mostly adjoining each other.,,The PEIR indicates there is 10.7 hectares of this habitat within Sunnica East Site B and that there will be losses to this habitat, however it does not specify its location or quantify the degree of loss.	NO	Within the PEI Report, the Applicant committed to providing at least 10.7ha of dry acid grassland creation and restoration across both Sunnica East Site A and B. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process such as the location of habitats. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation to increase land available for ecological mitigation. Parcels E11 and E23 (as shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for grassland habitat (ECO3 as shown in Figure 3-1). Therefore, there is no loss of semi-improved acid grassland as a result of the Scheme. The Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) outlines the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Are there opportunities for local naturalists to contribute to ecological surveys?	NO	The Applicant has welcomed and had regard to comments submitted by interested parties prior to and during statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	By Sunnica's own admission, this is a Solar Farm that will have an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) of epic proportions which will change the whole dynamics of the area forever.	NO	An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required to accompany all DCO Applications. The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme will 'change the whole dynamics of the area forever'. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application explains why the benefits of the Scheme outweigh the adverse effects. Overall, it concludes that there are no adverse effects that would outweigh the benefits of the Scheme. The Environmental Statement includes a wide range of assessments on the environmental effects of the Scheme on the local community and landscape [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A summary can be found in Chapter 18: Summary of Environmental Effects [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Where losses do occur these are not quantified. Data in the reports should be presented in a way that would allow the interpretation of losses of habitats compared to gains, and therefore assess the impacts more fully.	NO	The PEI Report represents a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application, see Chapter 8: Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is aiming to achieve a biodiversity net gain through the delivery of the Scheme and has set out proposals on how it proposes to achieve this in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the application to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The EIA is well thought out.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Table 8-9 notes hydrological connections for a number of designated sites and these, with the exception of pollution pathways, are not considered.	NO	Where hydrological connections are identified, standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, indirect effects to designated sites during construction will not occur and there will be no effect to the integrity of any statutory designated sites.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Designated sites which hold lichens and other sensitive groups have not specifically been assessed for dust.	NO	Standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, indirect effects to designated sites during construction will not occur and there will be no effect to the integrity of any statutory designated sites.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	We do not consider the use of the term 'reasonably practicable' as acceptable and the principle of avoidance of impacts on high quality habitats, including those designated as Locally Designated Sites and also Habitats of Principal Importance, should be integrated into this scheme from the outset.	NO	The Applicant has adhered to the mitigation hierarchy in development of its proposals. Management will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. This will be secured through Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	There are conflicting descriptions relating to the acid grassland areas within the supplied documents. Much of the area around E23 is shown as 'landscape offset' in the LEMP, but the Consultation booklet shows this as native grassland and Appendix 8b: Flora Survey described the area as existing unimproved acid grassland.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. Parcel E23 is no longer proposed for solar development and will instead be planted with species-rich grassland suitable for the prevailing conditions in the area. This is shown as ECO3 in Figure 3-1 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Please provide a detailed timeline (project plan) of what will be done before during and after the scheme to protect all wildlife including the soil.	NO	Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, which will be secured through the DCO, sets out the measures proposed to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on biodiversity (and landscape) features, and to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value of the Scheme. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects on species prior to and during construction. This are outlined in the Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Even if the conclusions of these assessments were to be accepted, it is clear that significant harm will be caused by the Scheme.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Chapter 18 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes a summary of all the residual effects identified through the EIA. Each of these effects are discussed in detail in the relevant technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. AECOM specialists are experienced professionals in their technical field and have based their statements and assessments on the most up to date scientific literature. All references are provided within each chapter. A Statement of Competence has been submitted as part of the DCO in Appendix 1C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which details the experience of each of the technical leads for the disciplines that contributed to the EIA.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The level of harm caused by the Scheme has the potential to be significantly higher than that set out in any of the individual assessments (once it has been fully and accurately assessed and independently scrutinised).	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Chapter 18 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes a summary of all the residual effects identified through the EIA. Each of these effects are discussed in detail in the relevant technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. AECOM specialists are experienced professionals in their technical field and have based their statements and assessments on the most up to date scientific literature. All references are provided within each chapter. A Statement of Competence has been submitted as part of the DCO in Appendix 1C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which details the experience of each of the technical leads for the disciplines that contributed to the EIA.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	PINS is set to receive soil studies that have been commissioned and paid for by Sunnica, biodiversity studies that have been commissioned and paid for by Sunnica and also a summary of the questionnaires that have been collated and reformatted by Sunnica. Plus landscape surveys, socio-economic surveys etc all of which have been funded/ supplied by them. Surely these documents should be commissioned independently?	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake EIA on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Independent scrutiny as part of the application and further consultation processes will help establish the reliability and accuracy of the assessment. There is potential for the level of effects the Scheme will have on cultural heritage, and their significance, to be greater than those identified.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake EIA on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. These findings will also be thoroughly scrutinised through the Examination process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	We would note that the assessment that has been undertaken overall, and those effects identified above, are solely based on the applicant's assessment and has not undergone any level of independent scrutiny. Such scrutiny is not possible at this time and as part of this consultation process given the limited time that is available.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake EIA on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	As with the assessment of all other issues, the assessment on landscape and visual impact has been undertaken by the applicant only at this stage and has not been the subject of independent scrutiny. Independent scrutiny has the potential to show more extensive landscape and visual effects than have been established in the applicant's assessment, higher levels of effects and greater levels of significance in some or all of the viewpoints assessed. There is also scope for further effects to be identified at viewpoints not assessed but which independent review may show should be included in the assessment.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake EIA on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. Upon submission of the application, all of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination and will be scrutinised during the Examination process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The LEMP does not specify where habitats created or restored will be and whether they will be amongst the panel arrays.	NO	The proposed grassland will be amongst the PV modules, as illustrated by the plans and figures in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES. The same document also sets out the location of other habitat provision proposed by the Applicant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The applicant predicts that the Scheme design has embedded sufficient mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features, without additional mitigation measures being required.	NO	This is correct.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The embedded mitigation provides no confidence that they will deliver benefit over the long term.	NO	The embedded mitigation has been assessed as part of each of the technical assessments by experienced specialists in their technical field. The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. AECOM specialists are experienced professionals in their technical field and have based their statements and assessments on the most up to date scientific literature. All references are provided within each chapter. A Statement of Competence has been submitted as part of the DCO in Appendix 1C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which details the experience of each of the technical leads for the disciplines that contributed to the EIA. Landscape and ecological mitigation proposals also have included management prescriptions, as set out in the OLEMP (ES Appendix 10I).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	If mitigations is implemented as described, this should be well managed.	NO	This is noted. Monitoring will be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I of Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) are being achieved. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the detailed design stage and included within the finalised LEMP prior to construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The mitigation measures outlined in the booklet seem good - but must be carried out with care and expert guidance.	NO	This is noted. Monitoring will be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I of Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) are being achieved. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the detailed design stage and included within the finalised LEMP prior to construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The mitigations are mainly concerned with the immediate effects. Not so much with the longer-term risks of soil erosion or chemical seepage.	NO	The long-term effects of the Scheme have been assessed as part of the impact assessment for the operation phase of the Scheme. The solar farm will have no adverse effect on subsoil, due to the extended fallow period that will enable recovery of soil organic matter and remediation of deep soil compaction caused by cultivation and high axle load farm vehicles such as harvesters and trailers. An assessment on soils and agriculture is provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An assessment on ground conditions has been undertaken and provided in a Phase 1 Ground Conditions Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment in Appendix 16B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This has concluded no significant effects during operation of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Efforts have clearly been made to avoid damage to- or loss of- ecological features throughout the design of the Scheme.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	No level of environmental mitigation can make up for a development of this scale.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, and the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out how this will be achieved. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. A biodiversity net gain principle is to be enshrined through the measures in the Outline LEMP in Appendix 10I of the ES, which will be secured through the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The mitigations proposed are vague and not comprehensive enough.	NO	The PEI Report was published at the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments and mitigation design prior to submitting the DCO application. Details of the mitigation measures are provided in each of the technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The mitigation measures proposed are more than adequate.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The planting and restoration of trees will mitigate the destruction of trees and habitats.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	It is unlikely that Sunnica will fulfil its impact mitigation premises especially in their poor financial situation.	NO	The construction, operation and maintenance of the scheme will be consented by way of a conditions established by a Development Consent Order (DCO). It will include requirements (which are enforceable through the Courts) for the scheme which would require the Applicant to implement appropriate mitigation measures for the impacts identified by the Applicant's environmental impact assessment activity. A Funding Statement [EN/010106/APP/4.2] has been included as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	There is no detailed plan for offsetting damage to agriculture, heritage or environment to be consulted on except native grasses, sapling planting and the promise of a plan.	NO	Mitigation measures required for offsetting any impacts to the relevant environmental topics are detailed within each of the technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Your summary states that 'no significant. adverse effects predicted net gain in biodiversity' How do you measure this? The loss of one species or habitat is not compensated by the increase/creation of another – when it's gone it's gone!	NO	The Applicant is committed to achieving net biodiversity gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving this was presented in Chapter 8 of the PEI Report as part of the statutory consultation. Updated details are included in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment included in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. Monitoring will be carried out throughout the Scheme's operational lifetime to ensure the Applicant's ecological obligations are being met. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, [EN010106/APP/6.1]) which will be secured through the DCO, sets out the measures proposed to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on biodiversity (and landscape) features, and to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value of the DCO Site.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The scheme appears to have been designed without applying the avoidance tier of the mitigation hierarchy, and as such would result in significant and unacceptable adverse impacts on important habitats, species and the wider natural environment.	NO	The Applicant has adhered to the mitigation hierarchy in development of its proposals and its ecological assessment has concluded that no significant ecological effects arise from the Scheme. The assessments have been undertaken by experienced professionals and in line with the current legislation, policy, and guidance. The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. AECOM specialists are experienced professionals in their technical field and have based their statements and assessments on the most up to date scientific literature. All references are provided within each chapter. A Statement of Competence has been submitted as part of the DCO in Appendix 1C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which details the experience of each of the technical leads for the disciplines that contributed to the EIA.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	How will the proposed created/restored acid grassland areas be managed in the long term as this is not specified in the LEMP.	NO	The Applicant's approach to managing the created and restored acid grassland areas is outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and is based on standard industry techniques for the preparation of the ground and implementation of new seed, followed by mowing regimes until the grass is established to support grazing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	I cannot understand the “native grassland planting within archaeological mitigation areas” is this the “creation of bio diverse habitats to mitigate the loss of existing habitats” if so I wonder who is going to tell the wild flowers, birds and animals that that is where they have to go?	NO	A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. The types of habitat that are proposed to be created / enhanced throughout the Sunnica East and West Sites include: biodiverse grassland, marshy grassland, nesting plots for Stone Curlew, woodland and hedgerow planting. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, and particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. Other areas of habitat will be managed for overwintering and breeding birds. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	We note in 7.2.13 of the LEMP the intention that species-rich grassland will be created underneath the panels. However, our experience based on long-term monitoring of other solar farm sites is that species rich grassland will not grow beneath the shading effects of solar panels, or between the panel rows if closely spaced, so this recommendation needs to be revisited.	NO	Throughout the Scheme, a range of new grassland mixes beneath the PV modules to improve the range of fauna and increase the biodiversity, in comparison to existing intensive agriculture. Management will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. This may include leaving open areas between or surrounding the PV modules or adjacent to new access roads. Vegetation would be established through natural regeneration or from seed collection from the grasslands identified within the Order limits and through a suitable long-term habitat management regime. Consideration will be paid to microclimatic conditions when considering appropriate species. Management will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. This will include creating disturbed open bare ground areas to promote annual seed-bearing plant species to benefit declining farmland birds such as Turtle Dove. Grassland will be managed by either low intensity grazing or infrequent hay cutting to allow plant species to flower and seed. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. This may include annual soil rotavation, avoiding planting of field margins and avoiding the use of herbicides around the PV modules.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Proposals for embedded mitigation within the arrays, such as for arable flora and wildflower planting, are vague and provide no confidence that they will deliver benefit over the long term.	NO	The PEI Report was published at statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Habitat creation proposals are significantly lacking in detail, and as they underpin so much of the mitigation upon which the EIA depends, represent far too high a risk of failure.	NO	The PEI Report was published at statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works. This builds on the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan which was published as part of the PEI Report under Appendix 10i. A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. The types of habitat that are proposed to be created / enhanced throughout the Sunnica East and West Sites include: biodiverse grassland, marshy grassland, nesting plots for Stone Curlew, woodland and hedgerow planting. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. Other areas of habitat will be managed for overwintering and breeding birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	No consideration is given to practicalities of management, the impacts of rain shadow from the panels and rapid runoff and shading in creating mitigation proposals.	NO	Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works. Case studies are presented in Agriculture Good Management Guidance for Solar Farms show that these concerns are unfounded.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Some of the 'embedded mitigation' is not so and would be more appropriately considered following the assessment of impact and identification of the scale of effect. This would include creation of grassland and woodland outside the operational areas.	NO	It is predicted that the Scheme design has embedded significant mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. This is enshrined through measures presented in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES. A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. By creating new and enhancing existing habitats, this will help to create a more complex ecosystem which in turn will improve the stability of the populations of species within the Site and those 'spilling in' from the surrounding areas. The types of habitat that are proposed to be created / enhanced throughout the Sunnica East and West Sites include: biodiverse grassland, marshy grassland, nesting plots for Stone Curlew, woodland and hedgerow planting. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. Other areas of habitat will be managed for overwintering and breeding birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Stone Curlew plots are not apparently included within the red line area and therefore this is not embedded mitigation, indeed it might be more properly regarded as compensation.	NO	Mitigation is defined as 'measures to avoid or reduce negative impacts'. Compensation is defined as 'measures taken to make up for the loss of, or permanent damage to, biological resources through the provision of replacement areas'. Discussions with Natural England and RSPB identified that the mitigation objective for Stone Curlew should be to ensure no net loss of breeding pairs in the Breckland SPA by embedding sufficient areas within the Scheme design to offset the loss of potentially suitable arable farmland through erection of solar arrays. Since the arable farmland used by nesting Stone Curlew to be lost is outside the SPA boundary itself, the provision of replacement habitat does not class as 'compensation' <i>sensu</i> the Habitats Directive. In other words, the replacement Stone Curlew habitat does not constitute 'compensation' for adverse effects on the Stone Curlew population of Breckland SPA but is intended to avoid an adverse effect on the SPA population by ensuring that there is no decline in nesting and foraging opportunities for the overall Brecks population, which might otherwise result in increased competition for resources with the SPA birds. There is precedent for this approach in the case of the A303 (Amesbury to Berwick Down) DCO in which replacement Stone Curlew plots were not deemed compensation for adverse effects on the integrity of Salisbury Plain SPA because they were to accommodate the linked broader Wessex population rather than to the SPA itself. The Scheme design has embedded sufficient land to offset any potential reduction in arable farmland, that may, in any given year, be used by Stone Curlew. All Stone Curlew habitat will be delivered within the Order limits of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	A very detailed landscaping management plan needs to be secured to ensure that the landscaping is maintained and where necessary replaced during the lifetime of the project.	NO	The Applicant has prepared an Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I) (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) which will be secured through the DCO. This will be developed at detail design (subject to approval of the Scheme) and that will set out the detailed measures for management and will be agreed with the host authorities.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The Scheme is proposing to turn a field into grassland whilst at the same time removing one of few remaining areas of true Breckland, partially covering the historic heath with development (refer to E23). This heath is unquestionably of environmental and landscape importance and with limited planning could have been totally avoided.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation. Parcel E23 is no longer proposed for solar development and will be used for embedded mitigation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	There is not much in East Site B allocated for nature.	NO	The embedded mitigation in the Sunnica East Site B includes approximately 60ha of habitat creation and enhancement to provide benefit to the local wildlife. This is not including the areas between the PV module strings and under PV modules, which will be planted with native grassland habitat.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The amount of planting proposed at the East sites is very small compared to West sites.	NO	The Sunnica East sites have more existing vegetation which will be retained and utilised within the layouts, but there is substantial planting at Sunnica East Site A via the new tree and hedgerows across Lee Farm and offset from Beck Road. The extent of planting is considered able to mitigate landscape and visual effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	That it is not considered 'practicable' to provide any mitigation for the Moderate Adverse effect on the Limekilns to address the significant visual effect of the proposals brings in to question whether the proposals should be considered acceptable at all on this part of the site and does not, in our view, override a need to address the identified effect.	NO	Due to the elevated position of the view, most of the Sunnica West Site A is visible from the Limekilns, part of the Jockey Club training grounds. These grounds and the intervening landscape are required to be open in character and along with ecological designations would not be suitable for planting. This is the reason it is considered not practicable for offsite mitigation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Should this application be consented, then a comprehensive ecological monitoring programme should be put in place to cover the life of the project, including targeted research on the impacts of solar farms on species and habitats.	NO	Monitoring will be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] are being achieved. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the DCO submission and included within the finalised LEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	What follow up surveys are their planned to show the net gain or net losses for the ecology against the original surveys? This is of critical importance to confirm if the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) and mitigation carried out by Sunnica and AECOM has been successful. We suggest that these surveys should be carried out at 10-year intervals.	NO	Monitoring will be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] are being achieved. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the DCO submission and included within the finalised LEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Will you be doing an EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) Consultation at 15 years to the communities affected by the Sunnica Scheme to show that your EIA has delivered as per AECOM, your world renown specialists you engaged as your consultants say it will?	NO	The Applicant has not agreed to undertake an EIA at 15 years. Monitoring will be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) are being achieved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The noise chapter does not provide any discussion as to the potential impact on biodiversity features as it only looks at human receptors.	NO	The Applicant has conducted a rigorous programme of environmental impact assessments prior to DCO submission. This includes assessments of the scheme's potential impacts on wildlife, where noise impacts are considered. The results of the Applicants assessments on the Scheme's impact on ecological receptors is included in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and concludes no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Can you please detail the assessment on socio-economic impacts, assumptions made and how the conclusion was reached that 'the only potential significant adverse effect that has been identified is the temporary impact on users of public rights of ways. (P27)'	NO	Socio-economic impacts were assessed in Chapter 12: Socioeconomics and Land Use of the PEI Report and have been detailed in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out and justifies the methodology for the Socio-Economics assessment, and details the findings.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Can you provide details on the assessments, surveys, impacts and mitigation measures considered (p19) in order to conclude 'minor adverse impacts' and 'no significant residual adverse effect on ecological features are predicted'(p20).	NO	Preliminary assessments and proposed mitigation measures were outlined in Chapter 8: Ecology of the PEI Report. The Applicant has also published the ecological surveys undertaken in Appendices 8a-8l. Updated details are included in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, which will be secured through the DCO, sets out the measures proposed to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on biodiversity (and landscape) features, and to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Section 6.3.3 states that 'it has been assumed that overall loss of vegetation will be minimal'. More detail and explanation of this statement is needed.	NO	A more detailed assessment of the land use change impacts on carbon sequestration has been undertaken since the PEIR was published, and further information is now provided in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Consideration of impacts to vegetation and have also been included in our ecological and landscape assessments (Chapters 8 and 10).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	An assessment of the effects on agricultural land during the construction phase is not provided at this stage and have been reserved for the Environmental Statement taking into account the construction methodology. Similarly, the effects during the operation phase are not provided. The omission of this assessment work, given the status of the proposals, is a cause for concern particularly where planning policy encourages the effective use of land by focusing large scale solar farms on previously developed and non-agricultural land.	NO	The PEI Report was published at statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application. An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Survey has been submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and an assessment on soils and agriculture is provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Agricultural Land Classification data to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The EIA looks robust, and all impacts will be kept to a minimum	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	Based only on the assessment work that the applicant has made available to date, it looks likely that the Scheme will cause significant harm and therefore, even as things stand at this early point in the process, the Scheme would need to give rise to significant benefits in order for there to be the possibility of the planning balance weighing in favour of granting permission.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Chapter 18 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes a summary of all the residual effects identified through the EIA. Each of these effects are discussed in detail in the relevant technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A number of environmental impact avoidance, design and mitigation measures have been identified to mitigate and control environmental effects during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Scheme. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. AECOM specialists are experienced professionals in their technical field and have based their statements and assessments on the most up to date scientific literature. All references are provided within each chapter. A Statement of Competence has been submitted as part of the DCO in Appendix 1C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which details the experience of each of the technical leads for the disciplines that contributed to the EIA.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	There are many contradictory statements in the preliminary EIA, and it does not read as a coherent report.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
EIA process	The lack of any assessment of the level of harm the Scheme will cause to the heritage assets identified is significant.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken extensive assessments on the Scheme's potential impact on heritage assets. The Applicant's assessment and regard to cultural heritage is submitted as Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A Harm Assessment has been undertaken and is provided in Appendix D of the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] which concludes that there is no substantial harm to heritage assets from the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This proposal needs much more investigation, and public consultation before it is even considered.	NO	The PEI Report was published as part of the statutory consultation materials and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers that the PEI Report, alongside the other consultation materials, presented sufficient detail to enable informed comment on the proposals. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application. The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. Chapter 7 outlines how the Applicant's pre-application consultation has complied with MHCLG guidance on how engagement should be undertaken. If the application is accepted for examination, it will be subject to further consideration and investigation by an independent examining authority over the course of a six month examination, in which members of the public are able to be involved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The current consultation is the first opportunity to understand the extent and scale of the scheme. The scheme now in front of us bears no resemblance to the site which was the subject of the original screening and scoping report and clearly falls well outside the scope of the Rochdale envelope.	NO	The non-statutory consultation was a voluntary consultation undertaken by the Applicant to gather preliminary views about the proposed development. It is common for Scheme boundaries to change as the Applicant has regard to feedback from the non-statutory consultation, indeed, guidance encourages applicants to undertake consultation at a time when responses from the public are able to influence the evolution of the scheme's design. The changes to Scheme have also resulted from preliminary environmental and technical assessments prior to the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This is an exercise in how not to do solar.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have no conscience about not telling the truth.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Re-do the Statutory consultation.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC, the Planning Act 2008 and other relevant regulations. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. Chapter 6 outlines how the Applicant's pre-application consultation has complied with MHCLG guidance on how engagement should be undertaken. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. Distributing the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 has been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The Sunnica proposal should be subject to a community liaison group being established.	NO	The Applicant is committed to being a responsible neighbour to those living near the Scheme and will continue to engage with the local community should consent be granted. A community liaison group is one of the measures that the Applicant is proposing to implement to ensure communication with interested parties during construction, operations and decommissioning. Further information can be found in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Appendix 16C), Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (Appendix 16F) and Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16E) which the Applicant has published as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Will local residents be kept informed of local road closures especially those without access to Facebook/papers?	NO	The Applicant is committed to being a responsible neighbour to those living near the Scheme and will continue to engage with the local community should consent be granted. This includes regular updates through a dedicated website, social media page and on-site display board. Further information can be found in Appendix 16C: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There should be a further consultation with local residents at time of decommissioning	NO	The Applicant is committed to being a responsible neighbour to those living near the Scheme and will continue to engage with the local community should consent be granted, including through the decommissioning phase. The Applicant has submitted a Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) as part of its DCO application. This can be found in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Given that the Scheme is anticipated to have an operating life of 40 years, the final, detailed, DEMP will be agreed closer to the time of decommissioning to account for changes in technology. Within the Framework DEMP, the Applicant has set out the measures that it will include in the detailed DEMP. These include a dedicated website and social media page to update the community during decommissioning.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	All parties involved must be kept updated.	NO	The Applicant is committed to being a responsible neighbour to those living near the Scheme and will continue to engage with the local community should consent be granted. The Applicant has published a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Appendix 16C), Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (Appendix 16F) and Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16E) as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These documents include details of how the Applicant will keep the community updated during construction, operations and decommissioning. This includes measures such as setting up a dedicated website, signage on site, and a community liaison group to provide a regular means of communicating throughout the lifetime of the project.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have not answered all the questions.	NO	The Applicant considers that it has answered all questions submitted to it within the statutory consultation period.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The Sunnica Covid 19 Consultation process is under a cloud of "Age Discrimination". Many of the older members in the village have a long association with its history and they care passionately about their environment. They are confused with the technology, the webinars and the cold phone calls which take away the physical ability to go to a map and point out their immediate concerns.	NO	The Applicant recognises that some people may prefer not to engage through the webinars. The Applicant has offered the opportunity for people to have a one-to-one telephone conversation with the project team about specific issues of interest. The Applicant's dedicated freephone contact details was published in the consultation materials. The Applicant has not undertaken 'cold calls' as part of the consultation. Analysis of the consultation responses does not support the allegation that older members of the community were not able to participate in the consultation. For example, 52% of those who indicated their age in their feedback were over the age of 60.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have discriminated against those who do not have online access and/or are uncomfortable with web technologies as apart from the brochure all other information has been online.	NO	The Applicant recognises that some people may prefer not to engage through the webinars. The Applicant has offered the opportunity for people to have a one-to-one telephone conversation with the project team about specific issues of interest. The Applicant's dedicated freephone contact details was published in the consultation materials. The Applicant has not undertaken 'cold calls' as part of the consultation. In addition to the measures set out in the SoCC, hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were available upon request and were offered to parish councils to display in a way that adhered to government guidance on COVID-19. These parish councils included: Freckenham Parish Council, Chippenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council, Fordham Parish Council, and Barton Mills Parish Council, Exning Parish Council and Red Lodge Parish Council. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have discriminated against those who are blind and/or poorly sighted by not providing braille and/or large print documents.	NO	The Applicant's website was built in a manner that was compatible with website reading software. The Applicant also added alternative text descriptions to images on the website to increase its accessibility to users of such software. The Applicant has published all consultation materials online which can be enlarged. The maps included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were available for download from the Applicant's website. These allowed the user to zoom in on specific points on the map. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 and was happy to assist consultees with any additional requirements on request.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have discriminated against those who are deaf or hard of hearing by not providing sign language at the webinars.	NO	The Applicant has been willing to provide additional materials on request and published a wealth of written material online including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, consultation booklet and maps on its website. A freephone telephone number and enquiries email were available through the consultation to contact the project team and ask any questions. Although sign language was not provided during the webinars, transcripts were provided in the event of damage to the recording and when the Applicant was unable to answer all questions during a webinar. Taken together, the Applicant considers these measures to have been sufficient to have enabled participation in the statutory consultation by those who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Having requested, on the previous survey response, completed in 2019, to be kept up to date with further information, you have to date not sent any updating information!	NO	The Applicant wrote to over 10,000 addresses in Consultation Zone 1 notifying them of the statutory consultation and subsequently wrote to addresses in the same area to notify them that the consultation had been extended. The Applicant carried out a number of surveys and made changes to the Scheme design following the non-statutory consultation, given that this work was ongoing for the time between the consultations, it was felt that the appropriate time to update the community was prior to the start of the statutory consultation when full details of the Applicant's updated design were available. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant issued an update newsletter to over 10,000 addresses in the same area as Consultation Zone 1 and has responded to enquiries that have been made to the project email and Freephone number.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have discriminated against those who English is not their first language as you have not provided documentation in any other languages.	NO	The Applicant has been willing to provide additional materials on request.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Access to information provided online is always helpful but would point out that our rural community does not always have the same level of access to digital and internet information seen in other areas.	NO	The Applicant recognises that some people may prefer not to engage through the webinars. The Applicant has offered the opportunity for people to have a one-to-one telephone conversation with the project team about specific issues of interest. The Applicant's dedicated freephone contact details was published in the consultation materials. The consultation materials were sent out to approximately 10,000 addresses within the consultation zone, including a consultation booklet, questionnaire and freepost envelope to return feedback. The Applicant's freephone number was published in local newspapers, on the project website and on hard copy consultation materials. Where possible, the Applicant sought to assist requests and enable participation in the consultation on a case-by-case basis. In addition to the measures outlined in the Statement of Community Consultation (Appendix D-2), the Applicant also made hard copies of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) available on request to parish councils in the area of the Scheme to host in a manner that was compliant with the COVID-19 guidance in place at that time. These parish councils included: Freckenham Parish Council, Chippenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council, Fordham Parish Council, and Barton Mills Parish Council, Exning Parish Council and Red Lodge Parish Council. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	As a Parish Councillor for Snailwell I feel it my duty to inform the inspectorate of what has happened in our village. At the last Parish Council meeting it was decided to get a consensus of the village as to how it felt regarding the Sunnica project. It was agreed that it would consist of three questions. Are you for, are you against and undecided? The questionnaire that went to the village did not contain any of those questions. Delivered to every household with the questionnaire was a flier headed "Snailwell Says No". This was not agreed to at the meeting. Whoever decided to add this flier has compromised the exercise. As a Parish Council we are unbiased and apolitical but this cheap trick to influence the villager's choice has to be noted.	NO	This is outside of the control of the Applicant and is noted .

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Door knocking has suggested that some households have been missed.	NO	The Applicant distributed the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to all addresses in Consultation Zone 1 in its Statement of Community Consultation. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets. Additional copies of all consultation materials distributed were available upon request. The Applicant considers this to have been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The onus is on parish councillors and volunteers.	NO	The Applicant distributed the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to all addresses in Consultation Zone 1. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets. Additional copies of all consultation materials distributed were available upon request. The Applicant considers this to have been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I have found out most information via talking to other residents.	NO	The Applicant distributed the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to all addresses in Consultation Zone 1. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets. Additional copies of all consultation materials distributed were available upon request. The Applicant considers this to have been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Now the vaccine is being rolled out why can't additional consultations be held next year in our village hall.	NO	The Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) process is a fixed statutory process that requires us to consult which we have done through the statutory consultation and subsequent targeted consultation. During the statutory consultation we consulted, as required by the Planning Act 2008, the community as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2). We received a significant number of responses as demonstrated by the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1). The Applicant published a number of materials to facilitate the consultation including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included the preliminary results of the Applicant's environmental impact assessment activity. Subject to the Application being accepted for examination, there will be a further opportunity for interested parties to register and submit their feedback and be involved throughout the examination of the application. The Scheme is a NSIP that the Applicant is bringing forward to answer an urgent national need for renewable energy generation. The Government has encouraged the development sector to continue to work during the COVID-19 pandemic to provide the future infrastructure that we all need. The Applicant therefore considers that it was appropriate to consult at the time that it did. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You haven't replied to a large amount of my emails requesting more information.	NO	The Applicant has responded to all emails requesting information received during the statutory consultation. The Applicant did not receive any emails under the identified name.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The online questionnaire is not user-friendly, pre-supposing an unrealistic level of computer participation and expertise.	NO	The Applicant considers the online survey to not presuppose a level of computer competency. The Applicant does however recognise that some people may prefer not to engage online. The Applicant provided a range of formats for people to give feedback on. This included hard copy and online questionnaires, with feedback received via email or in the form of a letter also accepted. Additional hard copies of the questionnaire were available by request and email, post and freephone contact details were published on consultation materials, the project website, and print media.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica have treated us locals with such disrespect and have been patronising and dismissive of our concerns.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought meaningful engagement with the community and has had regard to all feedback received. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The whole process seems designed to be as difficult and time-consuming as possible.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. As set out in Chapter 4 of this Consultation Report, the Applicant consulted in line with the details set out in the SoCC. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from across the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Matt Hancock is unable to represent his constituents due to his position as Secretary of State for Health.	NO	The Applicant has welcomed engagement with Matt Hancock MP throughout the application process and will have regard to all feedback submitted during the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	A consultation run in this way, whilst welcome and to some extent inevitable in these difficult times, will by its nature not reach and collect the views of all people in the affected areas.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant distributed the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to all addresses in Consultation Zone 1. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets. Additional copies of all consultation materials distributed were available upon request. The Applicant considers this to have been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I see there is a phone number, but I'm afraid I don't have enough information in the brochure to properly have a discussion with Sunnica about this.	NO	The Applicant provided the Freephone number for members of the community to enable them to request more information. No prior knowledge of the Scheme was expected by the Applicant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I only found out about this from the Say No to Sunnica campaign, the level of promotion by Sunnica has been a joke to keep it as low key as possible.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant distributed the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to all addresses in Consultation Zone 1. This was supplemented by advertising through local newspapers and appearances by the project team on local radio. Additional copies of all consultation materials distributed were available upon request. The Applicant considers this to have been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This project has been underhand and near secretive.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant distributed the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to all addresses in Consultation Zone 1. This was supplemented by advertising through local newspapers and appearances by the project team on local radio.. Additional copies of all consultation materials distributed were available upon request. The Applicant considers this to have been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that it received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate and successful in encouraging participation from a wide audience.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have not engaged with the local community in any meaningful or authentic way – you have merely parroted prepared responses.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought meaningful engagement with the community and has had regard to all feedback received. As set out in Chapter 4 of this Consultation Report, the Applicant consulted in line with the details set out in the SoCC. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a high level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The project team failed to take on board the points raised at the non-statutory consultation that future literature should be delivered on Sunnica faced envelopes, to raise the profile of delivery.	NO	The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. Distributing the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 has been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The reminder letter did not arrive on a Sunnica face envelope despite [member of the project team] saying it would on the webinar 'Repeat of Sunnica West Site A and Site B.'	NO	The Applicant considers that the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 has been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	They have not come up with any good solutions to engage with residents properly during the lockdown and escalating pandemic.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC and to encourage people to engage with the consultation in a variety of ways, having regard to the restrictions imposed by the pandemic. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. Consultees could request hard copies of the maps and booklet on request. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant's freephone number was published in local newspapers, on the project website and on hard copy consultation materials. Where possible, the Applicant sought to assist requests and enable participation in the consultation on a case-by-case basis. In addition to the measures set out in the SoCC, hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were available upon request and were offered to parish councils to display in a way that adhered to government guidance on COVID-19. These parish councils included: Freckenham Parish Council, Chippenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council, Fordham Parish Council, and Barton Mills Parish Council, Exning Parish Council and Red Lodge Parish Council. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. Chapter 7 outlines how

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			the Applicant's pre-application consultation has complied with MHCLG guidance on how engagement should be undertaken.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You arrived at the start with an attitude that it was pointless to object because it was an NSIP and continued to patronise local people throughout.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has undertaken meaningful consultation with the local community during the voluntary non-statutory consultation and the statutory consultation. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. Details of how the Applicant has had regard to feedback received during the non-statutory consultation are provided in Table 2-4, Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report. A summary of how the Applicant has had regard to feedback received through the statutory consultation is given in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I wrote to you twice for very basic information which should have been in the booklet and had to wait one whole month for a reply, even then only a few questions were adequately answered, most were referred back to the PEIR reports.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all enquiries that it received ahead of the statutory consultation closing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Prior to Covid there were some non-statutory consultation meetings which were very well attended which demonstrates how passionate our communities are about such matters.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. Distributing the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 was an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a high level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Why has only the Business secretary been consulted and not Ministers for Environment and Health.	NO	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects are determined by the most relevant ministry. As the application is for a large-scale energy farm, this comes under the remit of the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. In addition, in accordance with section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, the Applicant has consulted with the relevant environmental and health bodies for England.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	We do not consider the consultation has been run on a democratic basis.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC and which we believe made the consultation accessible to anyone who wanted to take part. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. Chapter 6 outlines how the Applicant's pre-application consultation has complied with MHCLG guidance on how engagement should be undertaken.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The suggestion that a further stage of 'Interested Party' allows for further feedback, is false. It is patently clear that this stage is of great benefit to the Applicant, as it will diminish the volume of response by intimidating ordinary people into giving representation at an inquiry. That is not open and accessible consultation.	NO	The NSIP process allows interested parties to submit feedback, a 'relevant representation', which is a written submission. The Examination is primarily carried out in writing. Parties can also make representations orally at hearings, which are supplemental to written submissions. It is not necessary for individuals to give a representation at an inquiry. It is true that the pre-application consultation is an important stage for the local community to be able to influence the proposals, and the Applicant has strongly encouraged feedback during that period. It is not correct to suggest that the Applicant has discouraged people from responding to the consultation on the basis that they should wait for a later opportunity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I know there is a pandemic, but I think that Sunnica could still have come to the village to give details about the Scheme. I prefer to discuss in a group, where questions arise as a result of group consultation.	NO	The Applicant carefully considered whether it would be possible to hold physical public exhibitions in developing the Statement of Community Consultation. The Applicant concluded that it was not possible to arrange physical public exhibitions in a way that complied with Government guidance regarding COVID 19 at that time. The Statement of Community Consultation therefore set out a consultation programme designed to allow people from across the community to respond while complying with Government requirements in relation to COVID 19. In addition to the measures set out in the SoCC, hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were available upon request and were offered to parish councils to display in a way that adhered to government guidance on COVID-19. These parish councils included: Freckenham Parish Council, Chippenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council, Fordham Parish Council, and Barton Mills Parish Council, Exning Parish Council and Red Lodge Parish Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Thank you for the chance to comment.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Who are PINS? How independent are they?	NO	The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) is an executive agency of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local government. Pursuant to the Localism Act 2011, the Planning Inspectorate is the government agency responsible for operating the planning process for nationally significant infrastructure planning applications in England and Wales. The Planning Inspectorate is entirely independent of the Applicant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I am deeply disappointed not to be able to tell my story and give my point of view to Sunnica in person. The Sunnica Statutory Consultation includes no in-person consultation or dialogue.	NO	The Applicant carefully considered whether it would be possible to hold physical public exhibitions in developing the Statement of Community Consultation. The Applicant concluded that it was not possible to arrange physical public exhibitions in a way that complied with Government guidance regarding COVID 19 at that time. The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries (which included one-to-one dialogue with the project team) and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The timing of the consultation during the pandemic has meant there is a lack of opportunity to voice opinions and give answers.	NO	The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. The Statement of Community Consultation included a consultation period significantly longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days and this was developed in consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant also extended the consultation period by two weeks, in part in view of the enhanced public health measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic adopted by the Government at a national level from 5 November 2020 until 2 December 2020. The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a high level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The consultation should have been shelved until after the pandemic.	NO	The Statement of Community Consultation included a consultation period significantly longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days and this was developed in consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant also extended the consultation period by two weeks, in part in view of the enhanced public health measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic adopted by the Government at a national level from 5 November 2020 until 2 December 2020. The Applicant is bringing forward the proposals to meet an urgent, national need for new renewable sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Government has encouraged the development sector to continue to work during the COVID-19 pandemic to provide the future infrastructure that we all need. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that is received, the Applicant therefore considers that it was appropriate to consult at the time that it did.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica have hidden behind computers and avoided answering questions they do not like.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC and which allowed it to engage with members of the public despite the restrictions in place due to the pandemic. The Applicant provided a range of means to contact the project team during the consultation process, including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. These were published in local newspapers, on the project website and on hard copy consultation materials. The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all enquiries that it received ahead of the statutory consultation closing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The proposals were changed to be closer to Isleham with no consultation.	NO	The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Scheme boundary to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. The Applicant revised the Scheme boundary prior to the statutory consultation commencing to allow feedback on its proposals, and it is incorrect to suggest the changes to the Scheme boundary were not the subject of consultation. Of the community consultees who provided their address, most were from Isleham. The Applicant has complied with its obligations set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There has not been a pre-consultation on additions to the Scheme.	NO	The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Scheme boundary to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. Revisions to the Scheme boundary were published for the statutory consultation commencing to allow feedback on its proposals. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination and at that time members of the local community will be able to comment upon by making a relevant representation and can subsequently be involved during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the application to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Very professional approach.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I called Sunnica and asked for a copy of the PEIR as this document is referred to throughout the brochure. They said they could not provide one as it was too big.	NO	The Applicant did not receive any requests for the PEI Report. Given the size of the PEI Report, the Applicant agreed to make hard copies of the PEI Report available at a cost of £0.35 per page. The PEI Report was published and available for download from the Applicant's website. Copies of the PEI Report were made available above and beyond what was set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. Hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were available upon request and were offered to parish councils to display in a way that adhered to government guidance on COVID-19. These parish councils included: Freckenham Parish Council, Chippenham Parish Council, Worlington Parish Council, Fordham Parish Council, and Barton Mills Parish Council, Exning Parish Council and Red Lodge Parish Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I was not able to look at the PEIR provided to parish councils due to the lockdown.	NO	The Applicant published the full PEI Report on its project website. The Applicant provided hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report to parish councils in the area on request as an additional measure to the activities set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (Appendix D-2). The parish councils that accepted the documents agreed to make them available in a COVID-safe way. The Applicant's freephone number was published in local newspapers, on the project website and on hard copy consultation materials. Where possible, the Applicant sought to assist requests and enable participation in the consultation on a case-by-case basis.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This remote process must not become a blueprint for further Schemes elsewhere. It conveniently silences the electorate.	NO	The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation. This included 725 individual responses from the community. The Applicant considers that distributing the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 was an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. This was supplemented by advertising through local media outlets.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I did not get a chance to consult as I am not online-literate.	NO	The Applicant recognises that some people may prefer not to engage online. The Applicant distributed a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1. The Applicant has offered the opportunity for people to have a one-to-one telephone conversation with the project team about specific issues of interest. Contact details were published in print media and on the hard copy consultation materials. In addition, hard copies of consultation materials were made available upon request and hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were provided to local parish councils on request. Where possible, the Applicant sought to assist requests and enable participation in the consultation on a case-by-case basis.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	We were led to believe in previous consultations that Burwell substation was capable of taking the generated electricity from Sunnica, but apparently the substation needs development for this.	NO	The Applicant included reference to the need to extend the Burwell National Grid Substation to accommodate the proposed Scheme in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and exhibition boards (Appendix G-4) that it published for the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant did note during the non-statutory consultation that it had secured an agreement to connect to the grid at the Burwell National Grid Substation. Details of this are provided in the consultation booklet and exhibition boards.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Why are we not being consulted at a later stage when you have a bit more of an idea what you are doing.	NO	The pre-application process allows the developer to gather feedback and useful information from the public and stakeholders that will influence the submitted application. The consultation material is not necessarily a draft version of the application and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed later in the process. The PEI Report was published prior to the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The consultation period should be extended.	NO	The Applicant considers the length of the consultation adequate to enable meaningful consultation. The Statement of Community Consultation included a consultation period significantly longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days and this was developed in consultation with the host local authorities. The consultation period was extended by 16 days in part in view of the enhanced public health measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic adopted by the Government at a national level from 5 November 2020 until 2 December 2020, and also in light of minor changes made to the red-line boundary. The Applicant received a higher level of response to the consultation than the non-statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Residents need an open meeting so they can have their say.	NO	The Applicant considered whether it would be possible to hold physical public exhibitions in developing its Statement of Community Consultation. Public exhibitions were included in the Applicant's non-statutory consultation in 2019. It was not possible to arrange physical public exhibitions in a way that was compatible with Government guidance regarding COVID-19. The Statement of Community Consultation set out a consultation programme designed to allow people from across the community to respond in a way that complied with Government requirements in relation to COVID-19. This is set out in Chapter 4 of this Report. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	We feel that the directors have not carried out their legal duties within the published SoCC.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. Chapter 6 outlines how the Applicant's pre-application consultation has complied with MHCLG guidance on how engagement should be undertaken.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The way in which consultations are conducted make communication immensely difficult and impossible to have a 2-way dialogue.	NO	The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. Details of how to book a telephone appointment were included in the consultation booklet sent to residents within Consultation Zone 1 by post and in advertising in print media. It was possible to register for an appointment by phone only and the Applicant made a range of appointment times available. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Zoom meetings are the Sunnica tactic to avoid face to face meetings with locals and interested parties.... are the Sunnica senior team too cowardly to face us or as we all believe, just in it for the money?	NO	The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. Details of how to book a telephone appointment were included in the consultation booklet sent to residents within Consultation Zone 1 by post and in advertising in print media. It was possible to register for an appointment by phone only and the Applicant made a range of appointment times available. The Applicant has not deliberately avoided face to face meetings and had to comply with the Covid restrictions in place at the time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You have refused to share maps and other associated information.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this comment. The maps included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were available for download from the Applicant's website. These allowed the user to zoom in on specific points on the map. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 or smaller and was happy to make A3 copies of the maps available on request. Contact details to request these were included within the consultation booklet. Copies of the PEI Report were made available above and beyond what was set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. Hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were available upon request and offered to parish councils.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The lack of consultation has not enabled other options to be explored for locations.	NO	The PEI Report was published prior to the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is established practice that detailed design only be finalised after submission of the DCO Application. Finalisation of the detailed design will be secured by a requirement in the DCO. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. The PEI Report did however include a chapter on alternatives, which considered alternative sites and the approach to site selection. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, at which time members of the local community will be able to comment upon them through relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Alternative Sites Assessment (Appendix 4A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The information in the brochure is poor. I can't consult on this - I need to talk to someone to see how it all fits.	NO	The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. Details of how to book a telephone appointment were included in the consultation booklet sent to residents within Consultation Zone 1 by post and in advertising in print media. It was possible to register for an appointment by phone only and the Applicant made a range of appointment times available.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I feel that it is unethical to be holding such an important consultation at a time when people are sick, or have other concerns such as job losses, etc. to deal with.	NO	It is not the Applicant's intention to cause undue stress on residents, and we have endeavoured to engage with the local community and provide information in a way that does not create stress in connection with the proposed Scheme. The timing of the consultation reflects the fact that the Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) that the Applicant is bringing forward to answer an urgent national need for renewable energy generation. The Government has encouraged the development sector to continue to work during the COVID-19 pandemic to provide the future infrastructure that we all need. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that is received, the Applicant therefore considers that it was appropriate to consult at the time that it did.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Due to the timing of this development, with regard to Covid-19 and lack of consultation, many residents are totally unaware that this is happening and the effect is it is likely to have on their lives.	NO	The timing of the consultation reflects the fact that the Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) that the Applicant is bringing forward to answer an urgent national need for renewable energy generation. The Government has encouraged the development sector to continue to work during the COVID-19 pandemic to provide the future infrastructure that we all need. The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through the Applicant's website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. The Statement of Community Consultation includes a consultation period significantly longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days and this formed an important part of the Applicant's discussions with the councils. The Applicant also extended the consultation period by two weeks, in part in view of the enhanced public health measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic adopted by the Government at a national level from 5 November 2020 until 2 December 2020. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that is

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			received, the Applicant therefore considers that it was appropriate to consult at the time that it did.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The NSIP process and lack of transparency in the statutory consultation process has made us feel like bystanders.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available through the Applicant's website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, at which time members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by making a relevant representation and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow further opportunity for the proposals to be scrutinised by the local community. The Applicant would encourage members of the public to take up the opportunities to engage with the NSIP process if possible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I welcome the short extension to the consultation.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica's response to the Covid crisis has been to extend the period to respond to the consultation by just 16 days.	NO	The Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) included a consultation period significantly longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days and this was developed in consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant extended the consultation on a voluntary basis due to minor changes to the proposed red line boundary and due to the enhanced public health measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic adopted by the Government at a national level from 5 November 2020 until 2 December 2020. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the local authorities to ensure that people could meaningfully engage with the consultation despite the existence of COVID-19 restrictions. The Applicant therefore considered the COVID-19 pandemic and the measures that were needed to ensure meaningful engagement during its preparation for the consultation, and during the consultation itself.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This scheme falls in the same planning category as Sizewell C where the applicants have undertaken meaningful and multiple and professional engagements with the local community in both a pre and post COVID environment.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken a mixture of physical and online events during the non-statutory and statutory consultation. Without commenting on the engagement undertaken by the Applicant for Sizewell C, which is a separate project, the Applicant considers that it has consulted in a manner which is appropriate to the context of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted in a way that met its obligations set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) which was developed in consultation with the host local authorities. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including: webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and by providing email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. Chapter 6 outlines how the Applicant's pre-application consultation has complied with MHCLG guidance on how engagement should be undertaken. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the consultation which included 725 individual responses from the community. Based upon the quantity and detail of the responses that is received, the Applicant considers its consultation activity to have been appropriate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	A housing scheme covering a fraction of the land area would have had a much greater amount of constructive consultation than has been undertaken in connection with this proposal.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this comment. The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC and which is appropriate for the nature and scale of the proposed Scheme. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available on its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC. The Statement of Community Consultation includes a consultation period significantly longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days and this formed an important part of the Applicant's discussions with the councils. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	We are concerned by the lack of opportunity for appropriately socially distanced, PPE facilitated, in-person, meetings for the formal consultation process.	NO	The Applicant considered whether it would be possible to hold physical public exhibitions in developing its Statement of Community Consultation. Public exhibitions were included in the Applicant's non-statutory consultation in 2019. It was not possible to arrange physical public exhibitions in a way that was compatible with Government guidance regarding COVID-19. The Statement of Community Consultation set out a consultation programme designed to allow people from across the community to respond in a way that complied with Government requirements in relation to COVID-19. This is set out in Chapter 4 of this Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You are bullying people to do this is a very underhanded way of trying to push this scheme through.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment, and considers its approach has been transparent, fair and open.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The consultation with Sunnica is via third parties who cannot answer questions.	NO	The Applicant has responded to all enquiries received by the community. The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all enquiries that it received ahead of the statutory consultation closing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica is very slow to reply to emails and often don't reply with information. I understand this is within your legal remit but this turns the consultation into a farce.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC. The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community. The Applicant responded to all enquiries that it received ahead of the statutory consultation closing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica has very much controlled the information and consultation to suit them.	NO	The statutory consultation was run by the Applicant. The Applicant provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available on its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There have been no 2-way conversations about the scheme.	NO	The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available on its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. Details of how to book a telephone appointment were included in the consultation booklet sent to residents within Consultation Zone 1 by post and in advertising in print media. It was possible to register for an appointment by phone only and the Applicant made a range of appointment times available. The Applicant therefore considers opportunities were provided for two way dialogue.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The booklet was not delivered until 25th September, 4 days late. A consultation of this importance should have been delivered on the start date of the 22nd September.	NO	The Applicant distributed the consultation materials to arrive from the 22 September which was the first day of the consultation. It is possible that some envelopes were not delivered on the 22 September due to the time taken to move through the mailing system. The Applicant published all information and materials distributed by post on the project website on the 22 September. The Statement of Community Consultation includes a consultation period significantly longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days, and therefore, even if materials did arrive shortly after 22 September, the Applicant considers there was sufficient time to enable meaningful consultation. During the consultation itself, the Applicant extended the consultation by 16 days giving consultees additional time to submit a response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The printing and posting of the consultation materials is environmentally damaging.	NO	The Applicant recognises that distributing consultation materials has an impact on the environment. The Applicant has committed to providing consultation materials to the community in line with its SoCC which is outlined in Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report. Where possible, the Applicant has encouraged interested parties to view consultation materials available online, and all consultation activity has been virtual. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. An impact assessment of greenhouse gas emissions was published as part of Chapter 6: Climate Change of the PEI Report and has been updated in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I don't feel that I've been given all the information I need to properly review this proposal	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC and with a view to ensuring members of the public have access to sufficient information to meaningfully engage with the consultation. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) and virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4), as well as making the full PEI Report available on its website. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The PEI Report was published prior to the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's preliminary assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	As a resident in the affected area, I feel this consultation is not adequate when considering the implications, it will have on us. Most information is 'preliminary.'	NO	The pre-application process allows the developer to gather feedback and useful information from the public and stakeholders at a time when feedback can influence the application ahead of submission. There are aspects of the consultation material which are therefore necessarily preliminary, in order to ensure meaningful engagement. It is also common for some matters of detailed design to be approved later in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Need to show on the booklets what changes have been made due to the first consultation and how many people had raised each of the FAQs.	NO	Details of how the Applicant has had regard to feedback received during the non-statutory consultation are summarised in Table 2-4, Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This consultation seems to be very flawed, a lot of the information you have provided is speculative- How can we comment most effectively on hypotheticals!	NO	The pre-application process allows the developer to gather feedback and useful information from the public and stakeholders at a time when feedback can influence the application ahead of submission. There are aspects of the consultation material which are therefore necessarily preliminary, in order to ensure meaningful engagement. It is also common for some matters of detailed design to be approved later in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica needs to better communicate net carbon figures to persuade moderate locals.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Scheme to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. Based on the total energy generation and the lifecycle GHG emissions of 161,768 tCO ₂ e, the GHG intensity of the energy generated by the Scheme over its assessed lifetime is 6.87 grams of CO ₂ equivalent per kWh (gCO ₂ e/kWh). This compares favourably with fossil fuel electricity generation and is comparable with other low carbon fuels. Table 6-16 within Chapter 6: Climate Change of the PEI Report outlines energy intensity ranges of alternative forms of energy generation. Further information can be found within Chapter 6: Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	It is no 'consultation' if the scheme remains a 'blank cheque' in critical respects. 'We would like to build this project here'; and 'we invite your opinions'; but 'we won't say what it will contain.'	NO	The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	It is impossible to make a valid judgement and make comment without greater transparency around the financial background to the scheme.	NO	The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. A Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] has been submitted as part of the DCO application. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Funding Statement to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Separating discussion by dividing the Scheme up may make comments relatable for your ease but the cumulative effect of the proposed area is what makes the Scheme abhorrent.	NO	The questions in the feedback questionnaire invite respondents to consider both Sunnica East and West sites separately to encourage detailed feedback on the areas of the Scheme most relevant to the respondents. The other four questions invite comments on the Scheme generally. The Applicant has welcomed all feedback as part of the statutory consultation, and its assessment of the proposals has considered the Scheme as a whole.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Applications for the various parts should be considered separately due to the diverse impact on the natural environment and the residents of the various affected villages.	NO	Whilst the Scheme is split into four parcels, the proposed Scheme represents one development. The Scheme is defined as an NSIP as an onshore generating station in England exceeding 50MW.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The boundaries of the scheme have changed since the previous round of consultations and we are aware that the scheme presented may not be the final version. Shifting boundaries mean it is impossible to make a proper analysis of the direct effects on homes and environments.	NO	The non-statutory consultation was a voluntary consultation undertaken by the Applicant to gather preliminary views about the proposed development. It is common for Scheme boundaries to change as the Applicant has regard to feedback from the non-statutory consultation, indeed, guidance encourages applicants to undertake consultation at a time when responses from the public are able to influence the evolution of the scheme's design. The changes to Scheme have also resulted from preliminary environmental and technical as well as results from assessments prior to the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I do not feel that questions on battery safety were answered sufficiently.	NO	The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. In addition to the information during statutory consultation, the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] with its application. The Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan has been developed in consultation with relevant fire and rescue authorities, and the Unplanned Atmosphere Emissions assessment has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The statement that the reduction of the overall area of the proposal is the result of earlier consultation is disingenuous. It is understood in the community that the landowner withdrew the offer of land around Freckenham.	NO	The Applicant has made numerous changes to the Scheme following the non-statutory consultation. The design of the Scheme is an iterative process and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed later in the process. Revisions made following the non-statutory consultation have set back the Scheme from residential properties and introduced extensive planting and boundary treatments. Further details of these changes are given in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I found it difficult to keep track of the information, legislation and abbreviations in your documents.	NO	The Applicant has sought to provide technical information whilst ensuring it is accessible to those from all backgrounds. The Applicant included a non-technical summary of the PEI Report as part of its consultation materials. Each chapter of the PEI Report provided a glossary and all acronyms included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were fully explained.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The brochure should commence with a chart showing how the companies connected to Sunnica Ltd interlink and another with the 3 principal directors their profiles inc. photograph age and experience.	NO	The Applicant has provided an organogram showing details of the ownership structure of Sunnica Ltd in Appendix A of the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] submitted as part of its DCO application. The consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) published for the statutory consultation outlined in its opening pages that Sunnica Ltd is a joint venture between two companies: Tribus Energy and PS Renewables.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Isleham residents were lied to and led to believe they would only be affected by cabling.	NO	The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for changes to be made to the Scheme boundary to reflect assessments conducted and respond to feedback prior to the DCO application being submitted. The Applicant revised the Scheme boundary prior to the statutory consultation commencing to allow feedback on its proposals, and this was fully consulted on as part of the statutory consultation exercise, including with the local community at Isleham. Of the community respondents who provided their address, most were from Isleham. The Applicant has complied with its obligations set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The SoCC is outlined in Chapter 4 of this Report, as well as details of how the Applicant has complied with the SoCC.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	As an individual with an engineering background, I found the level of technical detail in the PEIR and Statutory Consultation booklet was poor and mostly absent. This leads me to question the validity of the consultation.	NO	The pre-application process allows the developer to gather feedback and useful information from the public and stakeholders at a time when feedback can influence the application ahead of submission. There are aspects of the consultation material which are therefore necessarily preliminary, in order to ensure meaningful engagement. The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for some matters of detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The PEI Report was published at the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	We cannot provide valid comments on something we know so little about.	NO	The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The PEI Report was published at the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The [Rochdale] Envelope is inappropriately cited in some instances - as a means, it might seem, to elude meaningful data.	NO	The Rochdale Envelope assesses the worst case in terms of parameters within the Scheme that will affect human and environmental receptors i.e. if any parameters in the Scheme were to change post-DCO Application, they can only be reduced and the environmental impact would only be minimised. It is used to provide flexibility in design options where details of the whole project are not available when the application is submitted, while ensuring the impacts of the final development are fully assessed during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). It sets worst case parameters for the purpose of the assessment but does not constrain the Scheme from being built in a manner that would lead to lower environmental impacts. The draft DCO secures the likely worst case parameters, providing certainty that the impacts of the Scheme will be no worse than those assessed as part of this environmental assessment. The Applicant therefore considers the adoption of the Rochdale Envelope approach in the PEI Report and ES is appropriate, and it is not a means by which to avoid providing information. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Very little of the Scheme is confirmed so it is hard to comment.	NO	The pre-application process allows the developer to gather feedback and useful information from the public and stakeholders at a time when feedback can influence the application ahead of submission. There are aspects of the consultation material which are therefore necessarily preliminary, in order to ensure meaningful engagement. The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for some matters of detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The PEI Report was published at the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Please don't use the phrase 'Energy Farm' in any further consultative documents - it is not reflective of what you are proposing to scar our countryside with.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I did not receive a brochure initially, luckily a friend of mine was sent some spare copies after she requested them so she gave me one.	NO	The Applicant dispatched consultation materials to around 10,000 households identified in the core Consultation Zone 1. Copies of the materials were available upon request to those outside of this zone or those in need of additional copies. The Applicant provided a range of means to contact the project team during the consultation process, which were published in local newspapers, on the project website, and on hard copy consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The single banner placed near Isleham village hall misstated the end of the consultation as it had been extended to Dec 18.	NO	Banners advertising the consultation were issued prior to the consultation being extended. The Applicant publicised the extension of the consultation period to 18 December 2020 by writing to all addresses and elected representatives in consultation zone 1, all district and county councillors at West Suffolk Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Suffolk County Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, local parish councils and by placing promoted advertising on Facebook.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Most people thought that the consultation booklet was advertising and put it in the bin.	NO	The Applicant had a higher level of response to the statutory consultation than the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant considers that distributing the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 was an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The detailed surveys highlight that there will be significant temporary and permanent impact on the biodiversity, but this does not seem to be fully reflected in the general consultation booklet.	NO	The consultation booklet (Appendix I-2) summarised identified ecological impacts and opportunities as a result of the Scheme. The booklet states that minor adverse impacts on habitats and species are predicted, however, embedded mitigation measures will be introduced to mitigate these impacts and produce a biodiversity net gain.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I haven't got a PEIR, which is referred to a lot in the brochure.	NO	Copies of the PEI Report were made available above and beyond what was set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. Hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were offered to parish councils to display in a way that adhered to government guidance on COVID-19. The PEI Report was also published in full online on the Applicant's website. The Applicant provided a range of means to contact the project team during the consultation process, which were published in local newspapers, on the project website, and on hard copy consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The Consultation Booklet failed to declare the site acreage involved on each of the East and West Sites.	NO	The Applicant considers it has provided sufficient detail as part of its statutory consultation to enable meaningful consultation. The consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) provided multiple maps to show the scale and layout of the Scheme and additional information was signposted within the PEI Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	It was not necessary to produce an expensive glossy booklet.	NO	The Applicant has committed to providing consultation materials to the community in line with its SoCC which is outlined in Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report. Distributing the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 has been an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation. Where possible, the Applicant has encouraged interested parties to view consultation materials available online, and all consultation activity has been virtual.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I feel that the materials provided covered all aspects of concern.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The booklet used a lot of 'corporate-speak' in the text, where clearer language could have been used, without losing the need for the text to convey precise meanings. You DO love to mitigate and anticipate!	NO	The Applicant's assessments have been undertaken using industry guidelines and classifications which is reflected in the language used. The Applicant has sought to provide technical information whilst ensuring it is accessible to those from all backgrounds. The Applicant included a non-technical summary of the PEI Report as part of its consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I don't feel that is a sufficient level of detail provided about the plan in the materials.	NO	The pre-application process allows the developer to gather feedback and useful information from the public and stakeholders at a time when feedback can influence the application ahead of submission. There are aspects of the consultation material which are therefore necessarily preliminary, in order to ensure meaningful engagement. The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for some matters of detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The PEI Report was published at the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The scale of maps included within the PEIR are inappropriate. Plans at 1:18,000 or 1:32,000 are far too small and this makes it difficult to interpret mitigation proposals.	NO	The maps included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were available for download from the Applicant's website. These allowed the user to zoom in on specific points on the map. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 or smaller and were happy to make A3 copies of the maps available on request. Contact details to request these were included within the consultation booklet and were published in print media.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	On the maps there are no references to the overall area covered- it should not be hidden!	NO	The Applicant considers it has provided sufficient detail as part of its statutory consultation to enable meaningful consultation. The consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) provided multiple maps to show the scale and layout of the Scheme and additional information was signposted within the PEI Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	All maps included are unreadable and not to scale and even A3 size is still insufficient to correctly identify boundaries etc. The only acceptable map size is in an Ordnance Survey map scale 1:25 000 and these should have been distributed to each village hall for residents to visit and view.	NO	The maps included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were available for download from the Applicant's website. These allowed the user to zoom in on specific points on the map. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 or smaller and were happy to make A3 copies of the maps available on request. Contact details to request these were included within the consultation booklet.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The inadequate documentation makes it very difficult to truly understand the project. Is this deliberate in order to put people off engaging?	NO	The Applicant has undergone an extensive period of consultation to maximise feedback from the local community. The Applicant has provided a range of formats for people to consult on, including a consultation booklet and virtual exhibition, as well as making the full PEI Report available. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Parameter plans for Sunnica have had all Towns and Villages names removed which made interpretation difficult and lengthy.	NO	Parameter plans were accompanied in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) with maps showing the Scheme boundary. These included town and village maps. The maps included in the consultation booklet were able to be downloaded from the website. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 or smaller and were happy to make A3 copies of the maps available on request. Contact details to request these were included within the consultation booklet.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The survey form is not user friendly at all and feels like it has been designed purely to frustrate the user.	NO	The Applicant considers the online survey to not presuppose a level of computer competency, however, recognises that some people may prefer not to engage online. The Applicant provided a range of formats for people to give feedback on. This includes hard copy and online questionnaires, with feedback received via email or in the form of a letter also accepted. Additional hard copies of the questionnaire were available by request and email, post and freephone contact details were published on consultation materials, the project website, and print media.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Can Sunnica explain why there is no photomontage presentation of the battery storage units?	NO	The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for some matters of detailed design, such as the battery storage units, to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Parameters of the proposed battery units and examples of these were set out in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the PEI Report. The Applicant has provided photomontages within its application documents. This includes a photomontage of the battery energy storage system which can be found in figures 10-90 to 10-102 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Public rights of way should have been clearly shown on the consultation booklet plans.	NO	The Applicant provided maps displaying public rights of way as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) published for the statutory consultation. These maps showed existing public rights of way, public rights of way during construction and public rights of way post-construction. These were figures 13-1 to 13-3 of the PEI Report. These maps have been updated for use within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application (figures 13-1 to 13-3). The Applicant considers that the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to make an informed response to the consultation. The booklet could not however cover every aspect of the proposals in in the same detail as the PEI Report. For this reason, the booklet directed consultees to the PEI Report where further information could be found. The consultation booklet also provided details of the consultation Freephone number and email, enabling consultees to direct any further questions that they had to the appropriate channels.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	No details are provided in the brochure to allow us to understand the reasons why separate sites with long cable routes are chosen.	NO	The criteria used for site selection was published during the statutory consultation under Chapter 4: Alternatives of the PEI Report Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in Appendix 4A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The hard copy of the PEIR is unavailable.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the SoCC and to enable people to engage in a variety of ways. Due to the size of the PEI Report, it was not feasible to send a copy to 10,000 households. Copies of the PEI Report were made available above and beyond what was set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. Hard copies of consultation materials were made available upon request and copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were provided to parish councils that requested them.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The document makes 18 references to the PEI Report. A hard copy of that report should have been sent with the brochure to the 10,000 households to make easy reference.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2) and to enable people to engage in a variety of ways. Due to the size of the PEI Report, it was not feasible to send a copy to 10,000 households. Copies of the PEI Report were made available above and beyond what was set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. Hard copies of consultation materials were made available upon request and copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were provided to parish councils who requested them.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Everything has been hidden behind the PEI Report which can be acquired by phoning them for a CD/DVD/USB or a paper copy consisting of approx. 960 pages for 35p a page (circa £340)!!! This information was gleaned by Public Notice in the local paper.	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix G-4) and to enable people to engage in a variety of ways. Due to the size of the PEI Report, it was not feasible to send a copy to 10,000 households. The PEI Report was published on the Applicant's website. Copies of the PEI Report were made available above and beyond what was set out in the SoCC. Hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were provided to parish councils who requested them and agreed to make them available in a COVID-secure manner.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Realistically how many people are going to be able to go through this minefield written in jargon, not being able to understood by normal folks.	NO	The Applicant's assessments have been undertaken using industry guidelines and classifications which is reflected in the language used. The Applicant has sought to provide technical information whilst ensuring it is accessible to those from all backgrounds. The Applicant included a non-technical summary of the PEI Report as part of its consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Why are residents expected to have money available to pay for the PEIR or be willing to pay this amount of money to receive details that should be available in the first place?	NO	The Applicant has consulted in a way that meets its obligations set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix G-4) and to enable people to engage in a variety of ways. Due to the size of the PEI Report, it was not feasible to send a copy to 10,000 households. The PEI Report was available to view and download for free on the project website. Copies of the PEI Report were made available above and beyond what was set out in the SoCC. Hard copies of the core chapters of the PEI Report were provided to parish councils who requested them.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You didn't send enough consultation questionnaires to my house so I had to scan this one.	NO	The Applicant dispatched consultation materials to around 10,000 households identified in the core Consultation Zone 1. Copies of the materials were available upon request to those outside of this zone or those in need of additional copies. The Applicant provided a range of means to contact the project team during the consultation process, which were published in local newspapers, on the project website, and on hard copy consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Your booklet lacked detail with too much cross-referencing with the impossibly difficult volumes of the PEIR report, and too many acronyms but no glossary.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant signposted sections of the PEI Report to provide supplementary information at the end of each section of the booklet (Appendix G-4), however, the booklet was readable as a standalone document. The Applicant did not use abbreviations without reference. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Brochures are the most effective form of consultation.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You need another brochure with details about building and decommissioning the site and a proper section on the surroundings you plan to put in place.	NO	The Applicant signposted sections of the PEI Report to provide supplementary information at the end of each section of the booklet. Preliminary details on building, decommissioning and mitigation proposals were published as part of the PEI Report. These were available online or upon request. The Applicant provided several ways for people to find out more information including webinars with online Q&A sessions, telephone surgeries and including email, post and freephone contact details in consultation materials.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The maps on pages 9, 11, 17 of the consultation booklet were particularly lacking in regard to clear detail.	NO	The maps included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were available for download from the Applicant's website. These allowed the user to zoom in on specific points on the map. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 or smaller and were happy to make A3 copies of the maps available on request. Contact details to request these were included within the consultation booklet.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The maps on pages 23 and 24 of the consultation booklet were little short of useless for giving information.	NO	The maps included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were available for download from the Applicant's website. These allowed the user to zoom in on specific points on the map. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 or smaller and were happy to make A3 copies of the maps available on request. Contact details to request these were included within the consultation booklet.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Many people I have spoken to were discouraged by the style of presentation in the booklet.	NO	The Applicant considers that the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) provided sufficient detail and was laid out in a way that enabled consultees to make an informed response to the consultation. The Applicant provided a variety of different materials for the consultation including the consultation booklet, a virtual exhibition hosted on the Applicant's website, webinars and telephone surgeries. The booklet and the Applicant's website also provided details of the consultation Freephone number and email, enabling consultees to put their questions to the project team. The Applicant received a significant volume of feedback during the statutory consultation including 725 individual responses from the local community. This confirms that the consultation reached a wide audience and attracted a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The map legend was too small and difficult to reference.	NO	The maps included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) were available for download from the Applicant's website. These allowed the user to zoom in on specific points on the map. The Applicant recognises that not everyone can easily read the maps when presented at A4 or smaller and were happy to make A3 copies of the maps available on request. Contact details to request these were included within the consultation booklet.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The front of the brochure is misleading - it won't be idyllic nor will sheep graze.	NO	It is possible to use land within a solar farm for different purposes, including grazing, during the project's operational lifetime. It is likely that the vegetation will be maintained through a mixture of mowing and grazing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The first round of informal consultation was a shamble and raised far more questions than were answered.	NO	A non-statutory consultation is a voluntary consultation undertaken by an Applicant to gather preliminary views about a development. The pre-application process allows the developer to gather feedback and useful information from the public and stakeholders that will influence the submitted application. The consultation material is not necessarily a draft version of the application and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed later in the process. The Applicant considers the pre-application consultation undertaken to have been meaningful, reaching a wide audience and attracting a significant level of participation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica representatives couldn't answer questions as it wasn't their area at the non-stat. Too many unanswered questions.	NO	The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community during both the non-statutory and statutory consultations. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Having met both of you at the non-statutory consultation events, I am quite sure that my anger and frustration and inability to change this awful future are of no consequence to you. You gave the distinct impression of being the sort of chaps who listen with the sympathetic smile, and then walk away and think 'Peasant'.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought meaningful engagement with the community and is interested in, and has had regard to, all feedback received.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	It seems clear that in the aftermath of the Non-Statutory Consultation, they did not acknowledge or act on the concerns raised by the local population who were consulted.	NO	A summary of how the Applicant has had regard to the feedback received through the non-statutory consultation can be found in in Table 2-4, Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report. The changes made by the Applicant as a result of the responses received include: • In response to requests for the design of the Scheme to be subject to an external review panel, the Applicant engaged extensively with officers from the local authorities in developing the Scheme design. • In response to comments that the Scheme should create a biodiversity net gain, the Applicant set out its proposals for achieving this in Chapter 8: Ecology of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report). This has been updated following the statutory consultation and forms part of the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the DCO application. • In response to comments that the Scheme would impact on views from settlements, the Applicant set out mitigation measures in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the PEI Report. These have been updated following the statutory consultation and forms Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] • In response to requests for further engagement with local parish councils, the Applicant sought to engage with the parish councils prior to the start of the statutory consultation • In response to comments that expressed concern at the potential for noise impacts during operations, the Applicant carried out a noise assessment and published the interim results in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. The results have been

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			updated and published in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Where significant effects have been identified, the Applicant has proposed mitigation • The Applicant received a number of comments seeking clarity over how the Scheme will be decommissioned. In response, the Applicant committed to preparing a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, a framework version of which has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There is no regard for opinions as if there were, we wouldn't be having another consultation.	NO	A summary of how the Applicant has had regard to the feedback received through the non-statutory consultation can be found in in Table 2-4, Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report. The changes made by the Applicant as a result of the responses received include: • In response to requests for the design of the Scheme to be subject to an external review panel, the Applicant engaged extensively with officers from the local authorities in developing the Scheme design. • In response to comments that the Scheme should create a biodiversity net gain, the Applicant set out its proposals for achieving this in Chapter 8: Ecology of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report). This has been updated following the statutory consultation and forms part of the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the DCO application. • In response to comments that the Scheme would impact on views from settlements, the Applicant set out mitigation measures in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the PEI Report. These have been updated following the statutory consultation and forms Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] • In response to requests for further engagement with local parish councils, the Applicant sought to engage with the parish councils prior to the start of the statutory consultation

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			• In response to comments that expressed concern at the potential for noise impacts during operations, the Applicant carried out a noise assessment and published the interim results in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. The results have been updated and published in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Where significant effects have been identified, the Applicant has proposed mitigation • The Applicant received a number of comments seeking clarity over how the Scheme will be decommissioned. In response, the Applicant committed to preparing a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, a framework version of which has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There is no care for resident's thoughts- consultations will end up in the bin.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to the feedback received and has demonstrated this, in detail, in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report. The Applicant is proposing changes to its proposals as submitted including: • Further setting the Scheme back from settlements, including Freckenham and Worlington • Adding additional areas for ecological mitigation, including areas for Stone Curlew to the south of Worlington • Proposing revised permissive routes to improve connectivity during the Scheme's operating life • Providing additional detail on the process through which the Scheme sites were identified in Chapter 4: Alternatives and design evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This is a foregone conclusion as the infrastructure has already been installed (i.e., auxiliary supply to USAF Lakenheath).	NO	The infrastructure referred to in the comment is not related to the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This letter will be copied to the programme officer as I have no confidence that the findings of the consultation will be reported in a fair manner, especially as it is noted that little commentary arose from the initial consultation despite many people making very detailed representations.	NO	The Applicant is required to show regard to all feedback received. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. The Applicant has had regard to the feedback received and has demonstrated this, in detail, in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report. The Applicant is proposing changes to its proposals as submitted including: • Further setting the Scheme back from settlements, including Freckenham and Worlington • Adding additional areas for ecological mitigation, including areas for Stone Curlew to the south of Worlington • Proposing revised permissive routes to improve connectivity during the Scheme's operating life • Providing additional detail on the process through which the Scheme sites were identified in Chapter 4: Alternatives and design evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This is a box-ticking exercise.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought meaningful engagement with the community and has had regard to all feedback received. The Applicant has had regard to the feedback received and has demonstrated this, in detail, in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report. The Applicant is proposing changes to its proposals as submitted including: • Further setting the Scheme back from settlements, including Freckenham and Worlington • Adding additional areas for ecological mitigation, including areas for Stone Curlew to the south of Worlington • Proposing revised permissive routes to improve connectivity during the Scheme's operating life • Providing additional detail on the process through which the Scheme sites were identified in Chapter 4: Alternatives and design evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Many questions have gone unanswered.	NO	The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all enquiries that it received ahead of the statutory consultation closing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Local councils are opposed to the project.	NO	The Applicant has welcomed ongoing engagement with local parish councils and local authorities and have had regard to their comments as part of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	When questioned about the significant local opposition to the Scheme, the Sunnica representative at the Chippenham village pre-consultation event casually stated that the Scheme 'will definitely go through'.	NO	The Applicant recognises that the ultimate decision as to whether or not the application is approved rests with the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy who will make a decision, having regard to the recommendation made by the independent examining authority, who will conduct the six month examination of the application. The NSIP process is impartial and guarantees extensive scrutiny of any proposals submitted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There is a requirement for large solar farms to give communities the chance to influence the plans. The current consultation process has demonstrated that this has not been appropriately addressed by Sunnica.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. In addition, extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP, submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). The Applicant has further developed the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation, and the updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The further changes in response to feedback include: The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica East Site A and B have been reduced in size. This will set back the Scheme from residential dwellings in the area. Parcels E07, E11, and E23 are no longer proposed to be built on. This sites the Scheme further away from Isleham and Worlington. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E33 will be set back through archaeological mitigation. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in Sunnica West Site A and Site B has been reduced in size. This will set back the Scheme from residential dwellings in the area. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at W14 is being set back further from residential dwellings. Additional landscaping has been proposed at parcels W10, W11, and W15. Extensive treatments on the eastern boundary of W15 will help mitigate impact on Kennett Garden Village.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I felt I was subjected to a 'sell' from a business which was clearly going through the motions of consultation with no genuine interest in the views and wellbeing of the people who live here during the non-stat consultation.	NO	The Applicant has sought to engage meaningful with local people, and is interested in, and has had regard to, the feedback provided. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. The Applicant has detailed how it has had regard to responses received during the non-statutory consultation in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I doubt my comments will see the light of day or be visible to PINS or the Secretary of State.	NO	The Applicant is required to show regard to all feedback received as a requirement of the Planning Act 2008 and this Consultation Report does that (in particular in Chapter 6 and this Appendix J). The Planning Inspectorate is able to request copies of consultation responses from the Applicant if it wishes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I have no idea who will read this Consultation Questionnaire apart from Sunnica, who through the entire time I have felt are just ticking boxes.	NO	As stated at the end of the feedback questionnaire, feedback received by the Applicant was analysed by its appointed agents. The feedback has then been reported in detail in this Consultation Report which is provided to the Planning Inspectorate with the application. The Consultation Report will be made available on the Planning Inspectorate's website if the application is accepted for examination, and it will then be able to be viewed by the public, as well as being available for the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State to view.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	My daughter is disabled and cannot fill in a questionnaire.	NO	No contact details were left by this respondent to follow up on this enquiry. The Applicant has sought to make the consultation accessible and was prepared to provide alternative ways to leave feedback upon request.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Is there any way that the original questionnaires can be submitted to an independent party who could format the responses into a framework that could be sent to Sunnica to add their response/mitigation measures, and then this document be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for review?	NO	Feedback received by the Applicant has been impartially presented. The feedback has been reported in detail in this Consultation Report which is provided to the Planning Inspectorate with the application. The Consultation Report will be made available on the Planning Inspectorate's website if the application is accepted for examination, and it will then be able to be viewed by the public, as well as being available for the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State to view. The Planning Inspectorate may also request to see copies of the feedback received by the Applicant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	What does my age and occupation have to do with my opinion?	NO	The Applicant included the option for respondents to share their age and occupation as part of the feedback questionnaire but only if they wished to do so. This was to assess whether the Applicant's consultation had reached a wide demographic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Your survey is ridiculous whoever suggested these questions should be sacked.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The questionnaire was designed to facilitate meaningful feedback from the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This form is confusing and avoids asking important questions.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The feedback questionnaire provided questions aimed to give an overview of the Scheme at different stages of the project's lifetime, as well as feedback on both the East and West sites. The last question offers a freeform box for respondents to include any additional comments they have. Respondents were invited to respond to as many of the questions as they wished.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The implication is that without my personal information such as my age and occupation you will not keep me informed.	NO	The Applicant included the option for respondents to share their age and occupation as part of the feedback questionnaire. This was optional.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	This form has been designed to not encourage feedback - the text boxes are not large enough and the questions vague, and no way to really rate how I feel.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The feedback questionnaire provided questions aimed to give an overview of the Scheme at different stages of the project's lifetime, as well as feedback on both the East and West sites. The last question offers a freeform box for respondents to include any additional comments they have. Respondents were invited to respond to as many of the questions as they wished. There was no word limit on the text boxes included within the online questionnaire.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There is no opportunity to challenge the project team's statements on the webinar.	NO	The Applicant does not agree with this assessment. Opportunity for rebuttal was offered during the webinars as the project team attempted to take every question submitted and noted all comments received.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	People submit over 100 questions because you have not answered them effectively, not because you are consulting well.	NO	The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all enquiries that it received ahead of the statutory consultation closing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Q&As are not interactive and only selected questions were asked.	NO	The Applicant does not agree with this assessment. Opportunity for rebuttal was offered during the webinars as the project team attempted to take every question submitted and noted all comments received.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There is no independent person on the Zoom calls to question you.	NO	A member of the project team facilitated the Zoom webinars. This is consistent with the format of a physical public event. The webinars included a presentation from relevant members of the project team and a Q&A session where members of the public could submit questions. The Q&A format was used in the webinars because it allowed for people to seek answers while maintaining their privacy. This is important given that recordings of the webinars were published on the Applicant's website. Anyone who wanted a more detailed discussion was invited to arrange an appointment to speak with the project team by telephone.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Your facilitator redacted questions and fed answers to your panel.	NO	We do not agree with this assessment. A member of the project team facilitated the Zoom webinars. This is consistent with the format of a physical public event. The Applicant answered all questions asked on the events unless deemed inappropriate. The Q&A format was used in the webinars because it allowed for people to seek answers while maintaining their privacy. This is important given that recordings of the webinars were published on the Applicant's website. Anyone who wanted a more detailed discussion was invited to arrange an appointment to speak with the project team by telephone.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The online Q&A sessions, which I attended, were examples of the worst type of capitalism.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Some of the webinars have poor sound quality.	NO	This comment is noted. The Applicant assessed all webinar recordings prior to uploading them on the website. Where sound quality was not suitable, the Applicant provided a transcript of the recording.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica is not uploading the recorded webinars.	NO	The Applicant uploaded all webinars to the project website on a rolling basis. All webinar recordings were uploaded prior to the end of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	You haven't produced transcripts of Q&A.	NO	The Applicant has produced a transcript of the Q&A where sound quality has not been suitable. The Applicant has uploaded all recordings of the webinars conducted on the project website.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Webinars are inaccessible for the elderly and antisocial for people with young families.	NO	The Applicant recognises that people may not be able to view the webinars live or be comfortable with online engagement methods. The Applicant sent a copy of the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) along with the consultation questionnaire and a pre-addressed Freepost envelope to all addresses within Consultation Zone 1, as well as advertising the consultation in print newspapers locally. The Applicant offered telephone surgeries for people who would prefer to ask questions about the project this way and included the Freephone telephone number in all consultation materials. Each webinar was repeated live. Recordings of a webinar on each topic being covered were placed online prior to the end of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The webinar recordings do not show all aspects of the session, all of the questions, comments and actions promised and if completed or not.	NO	The Applicant has uploaded recordings of all webinars to its project website. Although the recordings do not include a transcript of all questions asked and answered, the Applicant provided downloadable transcripts where it could not provide a response during the webinar itself. The Applicant also provided a transcript to one webinar where the recording had broken. The webinars were only one of the methods through which the Applicant consulted. The Freephone telephone number, telephone appointments and enquiries email all provided opportunities to engage with the project team and obtain written responses to enquiries.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The host (Sunnica) is able to select which questions it answers, these sessions are not a true 'two-way' discussion.	NO	A member of the project team facilitated the Zoom webinars. This is consistent with the format of a physical public event. The webinars included a presentation from relevant members of the project team and a Q&A session where members of the public could submit questions. The Q&A format was used in the webinars because it allowed for people to seek answers while maintaining their privacy. This is important given that recordings of the webinars were published on the Applicant's website. Anyone who wanted a more detailed discussion was invited to arrange an appointment to speak with the project team by telephone.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There has been a low turnout to the webinars not because of a lack of interest but a lack of advertising.	NO	The Applicant advertised the webinars in line with the details set out in the SoCC. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. Details of how to register for webinars were included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4), virtual exhibition and the consultation website, as well as social media adverts. The Applicant considers that the webinars were well advertised.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The organised zoom meetings have been poorly attended which is completely at odds with the number of Stop Sunnica signs.	NO	The Applicant had a higher level of response to the consultation than at the same stage of the non-statutory consultation. The Applicant considers that distributing the booklet (Appendix G-4), questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and pre-addressed Freepost envelope to addresses in Consultation Zone 1 was an effective means of enabling people in the local area to respond to the consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Our internet connection is not strong enough to successfully access webinars.	NO	The Applicant recognises that people may not be able to view the webinars live or comfortable with online engagement methods. The Applicant offered telephone surgeries for people who would prefer to ask questions about the project this way and included the Freephone telephone number in all consultation materials. Recordings of a webinar on each topic being covered were placed online prior to the end of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Webinars were long winded and boring.	NO	The webinars organised as part of the consultation included a presentation from relevant members of the project team and a Q&A session. The Applicant sought to answer all questions posed in the Q&A session.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	I was unable to take part in any webinars due to my work.	NO	The Applicant consulted in line with the details set out in the SoCC and with a view to making the consultation as accessible as possible. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant scheduled webinars at different times of the week and repeated each webinar during the consultation period to account for different consultees' availabilities. The Applicant recognises that people may not be able to view the webinars live or comfortable with online engagement methods. The Applicant offered telephone surgeries for people who would prefer to ask questions about the project this way and included the Freephone telephone number in all consultation materials. Recordings of a webinar on each topic being covered were placed online prior to the end of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica arrange these at inconvenient times eg dinner time when residents are just finished work or are sorting out their children.	NO	The Applicant consulted in line with the details set out in the SoCC and with a view to making the consultation as accessible as possible. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant scheduled webinars at different times of the week and repeated each webinar during the consultation period to account for different consultees' availabilities. The Applicant recognises that people may not be able to view the webinars live or comfortable with online engagement methods. The Applicant offered telephone surgeries for people who would prefer to ask questions about the project this way and included the Freephone telephone number in all consultation materials. Recordings of a webinar on each topic being covered were placed online prior to the end of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Sunnica have tried to address this problem by enlisting the help of the Parish Councils, but the attendance numbers evidence this failure.	NO	The Applicant consulted in line with the details set out in the SoCC. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant recognises that people may not be able to view the webinars live or comfortable with online engagement methods. The Applicant offered telephone surgeries for people who would prefer to ask questions about the project this way and included the Freephone telephone number in all consultation materials. Each webinar was repeated live. Recordings of a webinar on each topic being covered were placed online prior to the end of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	It is very difficult for those who work to participate due to the timings of the consultation.	NO	The Applicant consulted in line with the details set out in the SoCC and with a view to making the consultation as accessible as possible. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant scheduled webinars at different times of the week and repeated each webinar during the consultation period to account for different consultees' availabilities. The Applicant recognises that people may not be able to view the webinars live or be comfortable with online engagement methods. The Applicant offered telephone surgeries for people who would prefer to ask questions about the project this way and included the Freephone telephone number in all consultation materials. Recordings of a webinar on each topic being covered were placed online prior to the end of the statutory consultation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The webinars have been poorly advertised.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant advertised the webinars in line with the details set out in the SoCC. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. Details of how to register for webinars were included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4), virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4) and the consultation website, as well as social media adverts. The Applicant considers that the webinars were well advertised.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Having to pre-book did nothing to encourage participation.	NO	The Applicant consulted in line with the details set out in the SoCC. The SoCC was developed in consultation with the host authorities. The Applicant scheduled webinars at different times of the week and repeated each webinar during the consultation period to account for different consultees' availabilities. The Applicant recognises that people may not be able to view the webinars live or comfortable with online engagement methods. The Applicant offered telephone surgeries for people who would prefer to ask questions about the project this way and included the Freephone telephone number in all consultation materials. Recordings of a webinar on each topic being covered were placed online prior to the end of the statutory consultation. The Applicant advertised the webinars in line with the details set out in the SoCC. Details of how to register for webinars were included in the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4), virtual exhibition (Appendix G-4) and the consultation website, as well as social media adverts. The Applicant considers that the webinars were well advertised.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Webinars have defaulted for most part to three potential answers: 'We don't have to provide that information until the next stage ', not consulting 'We need to do this to save the planet' - not consulting 'We don't know, it's indicative, a snapshot or an outline.' This is not consulting.	NO	The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised during the webinars. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all questions raised during the webinars either during the webinar itself, in writing with the webinar recording, or during the following webinar. .

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There are still unanswered questions from the webinar, they are now appearing in the re-run of the said webinar but the time taken to answer these questions is worrying to the point of neglectful.	NO	The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised during the webinars. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all questions raised during the webinars either during the webinar itself, in writing with the webinar recording, or during the following webinar.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Webinar Q&A sessions by the professional's fail to give a true answer, they merely direct you to variable reference points within hundreds of pages of the Consultation document for you to research your own answer and draw your own conclusions. A lack of transparency, support and community engagement.	NO	The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised during the webinars. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all questions raised during the webinars either during the webinar itself, in writing with the webinar recording, or during the following webinar. The webinars were only one of the methods through which the Applicant consulted. The Freephone telephone number, telephone appointments and enquiries email all provided opportunities to engage with the project team and obtain written responses to enquiries.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Having attended many of these webinars it is really disconcerting to ask a question, not receive a proper answer, and then have to wait 20/30 minutes for a chance to respond.	NO	The Q&A format was used in the webinars because it allowed for people to seek answers while maintaining their privacy. This is important given that recordings of the webinars were published on the Applicant's website. Anyone who wanted a more detailed discussion was invited to arrange an appointment to speak with the project team by telephone.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The meetings provided a basic on-line questioning system in which questioners did not have a chance to respond to the answers they were given. We feel this would not comply with equality and diversity scrutiny and suppressed free and responsive speech, giving the prospective developers an unfair advantage.	NO	We do not agree with this assessment. It is true that we facilitate the meeting, but this would be the case if we were able to hold physical public events. Opportunity for rebuttal was offered during the webinars as the project team attempted to take every question submitted and noted all comments received. The Q&A format was used in the webinars because it allowed for people to seek answers while maintaining their privacy. This is important given that recordings of the webinars were published on the Applicant's website. Anyone who wanted a more detailed discussion was invited to arrange an appointment to speak with the project team by telephone.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Will the batteries ever have to be replaced?	NO	The batteries within the BESS installations will degrade over their operational life depending on a number of factors including those relating to their lithium-ion chemistry and the manner in which they are used. Once the batteries have degraded such that their performance is reduced then they will be replaced. The indicative operational lifetime of the batteries can be calculated based around the number of cycles per day that the batteries are used and is typically between 6 and 10 years. The project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application and is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This includes details surrounding the BESS compounds where the batteries are located. Appendix 16F Framework OEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] explores details surrounding how the Sunnica Energy Farm will be managed including the management of the batteries within the BESS compounds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The operational lifetime will disrupt the eco system of the area.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impacts to ecology from the Scheme (ES Chapter 8) and no likely significant effects have been identified. The Scheme has also incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. A biodiversity net gain analysis is included within the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the principle is enshrined through the measures in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the ES, which will be secured through the DCO (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Will all of the power generated from the furthest points make it to Burwell without getting lost or seep into the ground?	NO	In choosing this site for the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm, the Applicant considered the suitable length of cabling required to connect the solar sites to the national electricity grid. The cabling required to reach the Burwell National Electricity Grid Substation is considered by the Applicant to be suitable to facilitate a viable project at this site. A small percentage of the electricity generated would be lost during transfer from the solar sites to the electricity substation but this is common of many other solar projects. Further information can be found in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	What is the evidence based for your estimate of operating life?	NO	The operational lifetime of 40 years is based on the expected design life of the project infrastructure and is an industry standard. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Can the operational lifetime be extended as it would be a shame to lose a clean energy source?	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Any development coming forward on the land at the end of the 40 years would be subject to its own planning consenting process, or alternatively, the operator of the Scheme at that time would need to apply to the Secretary of State for approval to vary the requirements to the DCO in order to operate beyond the 40 years. Further details can be found in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] of the DCO submission.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Could the electrical infrastructure be retained and re-engineered as opposed to decommissioning the site?	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Any development coming forward on the land at the end of the 40 years would be subject to its own planning consenting process, or alternatively, the operator of the Scheme at that time may need to apply to the Secretary of State for approval to vary the requirements to the DCO for the Scheme to continue running or to be used for another purpose.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Concerned about the fire risk of the installation.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6], that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. The Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	What is the life span of the project build?	NO	The Sunnica Energy Farm is anticipated to operate for 40 years after being constructed and the DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation. The construction and decommissioning stages have been assessed to be two years each. Further information can be found in the Framework CEMP which is Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	If all sites are connected what measures will be taken to ensure a fault at one site will not impact and the rest knock on effect to the surrounding area?	NO	The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm includes switchgears, which are a combination of electrical disconnect switches, fuses or circuit breakers used to control, protect and isolate electrical equipment. These are used both to de-energise equipment to allow for maintenance and to clear faults downstream. For further information please refer to Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	How has the problem of potentially de-stabilising the grid when the connection is added been solved?	NO	The Applicant's proposals include extending National Grid Substation via an extension at Burwell to accommodate the energy generated by the Sunnica Energy Farm. Ahead of delivering the connection the Sunnica Energy Farm will go through all the necessary commissioning and testing to ensure that it does not potentially de-stabilise the electricity network. Further details surrounding the grid connection can be viewed within the Grid Connection Statement [EN010106/APP/7.4] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The panels will not be functioning for 40 years.	NO	The project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This includes details surrounding the configuration, orientation and PV module types included within the Sunnica Energy Farm. While it is true that the performance of the PV modules does degrade over time the PV modules are still expected to be performing and producing electricity during the entire 40 year lifetime. The infrastructure will be maintained and serviced throughout its lifetime. These measures will be included in the Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP). Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP.6.2] includes a Framework OEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	What is the planned operational lifetime?	NO	The planned operational lifetime is 40 years and the DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The projected 40-year lifetime far exceeds expectations.	NO	The operational lifetime of 40 years is based on the expected design life of the project infrastructure and is an industry standard. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	We wish to recommend that the term is reduced to a maximum of 25 years.	NO	The operational lifetime of 40 years is based on the expected design life of the project infrastructure and is an industry standard. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The lifetime is too long.	NO	The operational lifetime of 40 years is based on the expected design life of the project infrastructure and is an industry standard. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Technological advances will make the Scheme redundant during its lifetime	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. That need is forecast to continue for the entire proposed 40 year operational lifetime. It is noted that a breakthrough technology may appear during its lifetime and render the Sunnica Energy Farm obsolete, although we consider that to be highly unlikely. If that is the case Sunnica Energy Farm could be decommissioned. Appendix 16E Framework DEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out more information on how the Applicant proposes to decommission the Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	40 years is a short time for such a massive investment.	NO	The operational lifetime of 40 years is based on the expected design life of the project infrastructure and is an industry standard. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Any development coming forward on the land at the end of the 40 years would be subject to its own planning consenting process, or alternatively, the operator of the Scheme at that time would need to apply to the Secretary of State for approval to vary the requirements to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	In order that the Scheme not be unnecessarily apparent at night, there must be no all-night exterior lighting	NO	The lighting will be mostly infrared, with lighting around substations and battery storage areas only. These will be sensor operated.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	During the operation phase, any permanent exterior lamps within in the development area should incorporate motion-detection technology.	NO	The lighting will be mostly infrared, with lighting around substations and battery storage areas only. These will be sensor operated.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The operational lifetime of the Sunnica Solar Energy Farm would need to be well patrolled and supervised along with well-advertised responsive telephone contact numbers for residents to be able to contact when they have something they need to report.	NO	The Scheme is proposed to have 17 permanent members of staff who will monitor and maintain the site. The Applicant will have regard to all concerns raised by residents during the operational lifetime of the Scheme. A Community Liaison Group will be set up prior to construction and continued through operation as a formal forum for local issues to be raised. A Community Liaison Officer will be appointed to lead these discussions with local communities during operation. A display board will be installed at the site entrance(s), where contact details for the Community Liaison Officer will be available should anyone wish to make contact. These measures are included in Appendix 16F Framework OEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The panels may have to all be replaced mid-term (maybe twice) resulting in further traffic and congestion and impact on the carbon footprint.	NO	As part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report), the Applicant provided potential emissions for the production and transportation stages of the Scheme for each of the key elements. This can be found in Table 6-1 in Chapter 6: Climate Change of the PEI Report. This information is also provided in Chapter 6 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. As part of this, greenhouse gas emissions associated with replacing broken components during the operation stage were applied to the product and transportation emissions calculated for the construction phase. During the operational phase, activity within the Scheme will be minimal. It is expected that there will be approximately 13 vehicles travelling to the Site daily.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	There is concern about the installations themselves and the amount of maintenance and illumination round the clock that they will require.	NO	During the operational phase, activity within the Scheme will be minimal and will be restricted principally to vegetation management, equipment maintenance and servicing, replacement of any components that fail, and monitoring. It is anticipated that there will be up to 17 permanent members of staff who will monitor and maintain the site. The Applicant will have regard to all concerns raised by residents during the operational lifetime of the Scheme. The lighting will be mostly infrared, with lighting around substations and battery storage areas only. These will be sensor operated. A Community Liaison Officer will be appointed to lead these discussions with local communities during operation. A display board will be installed at the site entrance(s), where contact details for the Community Liaison Officer will be available should anyone wish to make contact. These measures are included in Appendix 16F Framework OEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The monitoring of such enormous number of panels over such a large expanse of land could not be undertaken by the minimal number of staff proposed post construction.	NO	During the operational phase, activity within the Scheme will be minimal and will be restricted principally to vegetation management, equipment maintenance and servicing, replacement of any components that fail, and monitoring. It is anticipated that there will be up to 17 permanent members of staff who will monitor and maintain the site. The Applicant will have regard to concerns raised by residents during the operational lifetime of the Scheme. A Community Liaison Group will be set up prior to construction and continued through operation as a formal forum for local issues to be raised. A Community Liaison Officer will be appointed to lead these discussions with local communities during operation. A display board will be installed at the site entrance(s), where contact details for the Community Liaison Officer will be available should anyone wish to make contact. These measures are included in Appendix 16F Framework OEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	What happens if Sunnica and/or PS and Tribus are unable to continue their part of the development?	NO	The Applicant and its constituent companies and consultants have an established tracked record of delivering projects of this kind. The Applicant's means of funding the project is set out in the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2]. Should the development consent be granted, it will include various powers and requirements that would be legally enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Further information on the Applicant's proposed development consent order conditions can be found in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Sunnica already has a negative in accounts, and therefore may not be viable for the site's duration	NO	The Applicant and its constituent companies and consultants have an established tracked record of delivering projects of this kind. The Applicant's means of funding the project is set out in the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2]. Should the development consent be granted, it will include various powers and requirements that would be legally enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Further information on the Applicant's proposed development consent order conditions can be found in the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Leaves many questions unanswered about maintenance and oversight when the Scheme is in place.	NO	During the operational phase, activity within the Scheme will be minimal and will be restricted principally to vegetation management, equipment maintenance and servicing, replacement of any components that fail, and monitoring. It is anticipated that there will be up to 17 permanent members of staff who will monitor and maintain the site. Further information can be found in Appendix 16F: Framework OEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Despite being a commercial operation there should be a Governing Body with representation from local villages and towns as well as local councils both Parish and District.	NO	Should consent be granted, the Applicant is committed to engaging with the community during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases and would look to establish a community liaison group that would be made up of invited community representatives such as local councillors and residents. Such a body would be established through consultation with the host authorities subject to the Applicant receiving development consent. This measure is included in Appendix 16F Framework OEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The operational management should minimise fuel demands and, in particular, avoid the spraying of any chemicals in weed and herbage management.	NO	The Applicant welcomes this feedback. The Outline LEMP in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] details the landscape and vegetation management techniques that will be adopted during operation. Additionally, a Framework OEMP has been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which outlines the mitigation requirements to be employed during operation to minimise environmental impacts. These documents will be finalised for approval by the relevant local planning authorities prior to operation of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	There must be an objective that in the operation phase (including scheduled maintenance), no sound will emanate from the Sunnica Energy Farm audible to typical human hearing.	NO	As outlined in Chapter 11: Noise & Vibration of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], no specific noise mitigation measures have been included for operational plant based on the results of the assessment. However, based on the proposed plant installations the Applicant is committed to designing and selecting plant which will have no tonal, impulsive or intermittent features. This was outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. Revised assessments have been submitted as part of the ES in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP/010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	There is already noise evident from the Burwell sub-station which will impact residents.	NO	While the Burwell Substation Extension may result in an audible change to absolute levels of noise at the nearest receptors, it is not expected that plant installations at the expansion would result in any noticeable changes to the character of existing noise environment in this area. The Applicant has assessed that there would be a minor adverse impact from Burwell substation expansion at night on receptor R1. This is not considered significant. This was outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. Updated assessments have been submitted as part of the ES [APP/010106/APP/6.1] Chapter 11.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	What is the projected noise impact from the additional load on the lines and transformers, and associated cooling systems?	NO	Noise impacts of the solar plant during the operational lifetime are predicted to equate to a negligible to minor adverse effect, which is not considered significant. This was outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. Updated assessments have been submitted as part of the ES [APP/010106/APP/6.1] Chapter 11. Information regarding operational noise modelling is presented in Appendix 11F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] including information regarding assumed sound levels of the Scheme's proposed inverters, transformers and battery units.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Low frequency hum from the fixed plant in both the construction and operation stages could have an adverse effect upon the Fordham Abbey Estate.	NO	It is not expected that the expansion would result in any noticeable changes to the character of the existing noise environment in this area. The Applicant has assessed that there would be a negligible impact on receptor R3 which is considered representative of Fordham Abbey. This is not considered significant. This was outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. Revised assessments have been submitted as part of the ES [APP/010106/APP/6.1] Chapter 11. Updated assessments have taken into account the location of the proposed extension. This has resulted in no change to the anticipated impact at R3.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	There is already a loud hum evident from the Burwell substation which will be exacerbated.	NO	It is not expected that the expansion would result in any noticeable changes to the character of the existing noise environment in this area. The Applicant has assessed that there would be a minor adverse impact from Burwell substation expansion at night on receptor R1. This is not considered significant. This was outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. Revised assessments have been submitted as part of the ES [APP/010106/APP/6.1] Chapter 11. Updated assessments have taken into account the location of the proposed extension. This has resulted in no change to the anticipated impact at R1.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Electrical noise (radio frequency pollution) generated in power conversion must be minimised and below CE guidelines.	NO	Operational noise levels will be controlled using embedded mitigation. Noise impacts of the solar plant during the operational lifetime are predicted to equate to a negligible to minor adverse effect, which is not considered significant. This was outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the PEI Report. Revised assessments have been submitted as part of the ES [APP/010106/APP/6.1] Chapter 11 and mitigation measures set out in the OEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The smell will be horrendous.	NO	The Scheme is not anticipated to have any impact on odour, therefore odour was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) at the scoping stage undertaken in 2019 and this approach was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	The intended business model for the BESS is likely to involve grid surpluses that come from outside Sunnica. It is not a 'self-contained power station' as implied by the Non-Statutory Consultation.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The BESS is designed to provide peak generation and grid balancing services to the electricity grid by primarily allowing excess electricity generated from the PV modules, as well as electricity imported from the electricity grid, to be stored in batteries and dispatched when required. The Applicant agrees with the respondent that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is not a 'self-contained power station' given its connection to the National Grid and it has not been its intention to suggest otherwise.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Can you provide more detail on the light, noise and dust pollution and how it will impact Snailwell in relative terms that a lay person could interpret?	NO	The Applicant assessed noise impacts from The Green, Snailwell. There will be a very low noise impact arising from the Scheme throughout the Scheme's lifecycle. This will not result in a significant effect. Noise and vibration have been assessed in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has found there will be no significant effects on air quality during construction and operation of the Scheme. Air quality has been assessed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The lighting used on the Scheme will be mostly infrared, with floodlighting around substations and battery storage. The Applicant has adopted mitigation principles to minimise artificial light spill from the Site. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into Appendix 16C Framework CEMP, Appendix 16E Framework DEMP, and Appendix 16F Framework OEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Will security be placed around the Burwell sub-station?	No	The Sunnica Energy Farm design will ensure that the equipment is secure to minimise the potential for damage to occur through criminal activity. Embedded mitigation will include fencing, CCTV cameras and lighting in critical areas. Fencing will be established at the earliest stage of construction commencing. A project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Please proceed quickly.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Hope the development will stick to the proposed timescale.	NO	The construction programme is anticipated to be two years, with operation expected to start following construction no earlier than 2025. The operational lifetime of 40 years is based on the expected design life of the project infrastructure and is an industry standard. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	What contingency is in place for decommissioning if Sunnica is unable to fulfil their obligations?	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable via the Planning Act 2008.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The profit made from the development should be used to ensure the cost of decommissioning does not fall onto taxpayers.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable via the Planning Act 2008.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There are no funds deposited with trustees to cover future decommission costs.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable via the Planning Act 2008. In light of this, the Applicant does not consider there is a need for any additional measures to be put in place.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There should be an escrow account to put in a % of funds for decommissioning.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable via the Planning Act 2008. In light of this, the Applicant does not consider there is a need for any additional measures to be put in place.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Concerned about scale of the work required to return land to agricultural use.	NO	The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will be prepared to outline how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. It is anticipated that the decommissioning phase will take 24 months. Details of the Framework DEMP can be viewed in Appendix 16E Framework DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Subject to the Applicant receiving development consent, the DEMP will be updated to account for technological changes, and require approval by the relevant local planning authorities prior to the start of any decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Debris will not be disposed of and will remain on the site.	NO	A Framework DEMP has been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This requires the preparation of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP) is prepared in advance of decommissioning. This will provide further detail on techniques and specific facilities which would be required in advance of the decommissioning stage, in line with relevant legislation and guidance at that time. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	You claim in your brochure 'waste arisings will be managed in line with waste hierarchy.' What does this mean?	NO	The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as amended) transpose the Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC in England and Wales and require waste prevention programmes and waste management plans that apply the Waste Hierarchy. Every project is required to adopt this approach. The Waste Hierarchy ranks waste management options according to what is best for the environment. Priority is given to preventing waste, however when waste is created, it gives priority for preparing it for re-use, then recycling, then recovery and lastly disposal. Opportunities to re-use material resources will be sought throughout construction, operation and decommissioning. If this is not possible, materials will be recycled - recyclable materials include (but are certainly not limited to) the PV modules, batteries, mountings, electrical infrastructure, cables and aggregates. Where avoidance, re-use and recycling is not possible, the last resort in disposing of waste would be taking materials to landfill.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	How will toxic waste be safely disposed of?	NO	A Framework DEMP has been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This requires the preparation of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP) is prepared in advance of decommissioning. This will provide further detail on techniques and specific facilities, including toxic waste, which would be required in advance of the decommissioning stage, in line with relevant legislation and guidance at that time. Toxic and hazardous waste will be treated by an authorised operator, and the transportation of hazardous waste will also require an authorised carrier. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The batteries and panels cannot be recycled, so their disposal will impact the environment.	NO	Prior to decommissioning, opportunities to minimise waste as far as possible will be explored. Possibilities to re-use or recycle materials will be explored before resorting to landfill options. There is a new industry emerging for recycling PV modules. This would be explored, in addition to any resale of any operational PV modules. Waste during the decommissioning phase will be dealt with as part of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), which will be produced prior to decommissioning, and in line with relevant legislation and guidance at that time. The Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO is required to include a resource management plan that includes details of proposals to minimise the use of natural resources and unnecessary materials. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) is included in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	How will solar panel supports be removed?	NO	The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared to outline how this will be achieved prior to the start of any decommissioning works. Details of this can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This will set out how the Applicant intends to remove PV module supports. In simple terms they are likely to be pulled out of the ground and taken away from the site to be recycled where possible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	You have already admitted you are keeping the cables in situ.	NO	Standard industry practice is to keep the main cable circuits that connect Sunnica East and Sunnica West with the National Grid Substation Extension at Burwell in place at the end of the operational lifetime of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Leaving the cables <i>in situ</i> would result in fewer environmental impacts than digging them up and removing them during decommissioning. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared to outline how this will be achieved prior to any decommissioning works commencing. Details of this can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There is a possibility that the decommissioning of this huge scale proposal could lead to many tonnes of toxic waste being left for our future generations.	NO	Toxic and hazardous waste will be treated by an authorised operator, and the transportation of hazardous waste will also require an authorised carrier. Materials are to be dealt with in accordance with the DEMP - a Framework DEMP has been submitted with the DCO Application, provided in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A Decommissioning Resource Management Plan will be produced prior to decommissioning (as required by the DEMP), which will provide further details of waste management, including toxic and hazardous waste. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The vague statements made concerning the removal of facilities and reinstatement of the sites is an example of lack of compliance with Policy ENV 6 of the East Cambs Local Plan.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. A Framework DEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of the DCO Application. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is enforceable via the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. This is compliant with Policy ENV6 of the East Cambs Local Plan which states provisions should be made for the removal of facilities and reinstatement of the site.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	All the structures and any works (such as tracks) must be capable of removal or reversible.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. A Framework DEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of the DCO Application. Standard industry practice is to keep the main cable circuits that connect Sunnica East and Sunnica West with the National Grid Substation Extension at Burwell in place at the end of the operational lifetime of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Leaving the cables <i>in situ</i> would result in fewer environmental impacts than digging them up and removing them during decommissioning. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared to outline how this will be achieved prior to any decommissioning works commencing. Details of this can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The site shouldn't be decommissioned and should be made permanent.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Any development coming forward on the land at the end of the 40 years would be subject to its own planning consenting process, or alternatively, the operator of the Scheme at that time would need to apply to the Secretary of State for approval to vary the requirements to the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	As the life span of cabling is 60 years, it is unlikely it will be removed. It is more likely the infrastructure will be kept, and the solar panels and associated equipment will be updated.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process. Standard industry practice is to keep the main cable circuits that connect Sunnica East and Sunnica West with the National Grid Substation Extension at Burwell in place at the end of the operational lifetime of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Leaving the cables <i>in situ</i> would result in fewer environmental impacts than digging them up and removing them during decommissioning. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared to outline how this will be achieved prior to any decommissioning works commencing. Details of this can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Returning the land to previous condition may not be best, as it would result in the loss of new woodland and wetland areas.	NO	It is proposed that ecological enhanced areas and new planting will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of the land and it may be returned to agriculture.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The four sites should be rewilded.	NO	Anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or development consent order application, in the same way as housing or industrial uses require this consent now. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. A Framework DEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of the DCO Application. It is proposed that ecological enhanced areas and new planting will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of the land and it may be returned to agriculture.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The proposal will make it more likely that industrial or housing development will be put on the land after its lifetime.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Will the land still be fertile for agriculture in the future?	NO	The land will be fertile for agriculture in the future, in fact, the extended fallow period will enable the recovery of soil organic matter, depleted by repeated cultivation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Use of concrete and toxic leakages in the soil means the land can't be returned to farmland.	NO	As per Chapter 3, Scheme Description within the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1], the batteries will be housed in containers. This will ensure that any leakages will be contained and not result in contamination of the ground and groundwater. A fully functional PV module is not toxic and does not present a danger to its surrounding environs. The Applicant does however recognise the potential for PV modules to be damaged and to leak. For this reason, the OEMP will include a regime of regular checks to identify and fix any damage prior to their being any leaks from the PV modules. The Plan will also set out precautions to be followed during maintenance activities to minimise the risk of any leaks. Best practice avoidance and mitigation measures for ground contamination are outlined in the Framework CEMP which is included under Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Monitoring will be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] are being achieved. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the DCO submission and included within the finalised LEMP. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There is no guarantee it will be returned to farmland.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There is no going back once it is done.	NO	Anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or development consent order application. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use. Details of the Draft DCO can be found within the DCO submission documents [EN010106/APP/3.1]. Further to this, a DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. Further details can be viewed in Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and the DEMP that is prepared for approval will reflect changes in technology prior to the start of decommissioning.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Detail must be provided on whether habitats created as part of the development can be conserved rather than reverted to the baseline after 2065.	NO	The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. It is proposed that ecological enhanced areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of the land and it may be returned to agriculture. The Framework DEMP is available in Appendix 16E of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	How long will it take to get the landscape back to the way it is?	NO	The decommissioning phase of the Scheme is anticipated to take two years.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There is no information on the decommissioning.	NO	The Applicant provided details on decommissioning during the statutory consultation in the consultation booklet and PEI Report. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Detail of decommissioning is also outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES submitted with the application [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Decommissioning relies on generalisations such as hoping in 30 years time that it will be sorted.	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. Prior to decommissioning, opportunities to minimise waste as far as possible will be explored. Possibilities to re-use or recycle materials will be explored before resorting to landfill options. There is a new industry emerging for recycling PV modules. This would be explored, in addition to any resale of any operational PV modules. Waste during the decommissioning phase will be dealt with as part of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), which will be produced prior to decommissioning, and in line with relevant legislation and guidance at that time. The Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) is required to the DRMP. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Should the Company become bankrupt, who will be responsible for the decommissioning costs?	NO	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	During the lifetime of the farm, Sunnica should be active in developing safe and environmentally friendly ways of disposing of the panels.	NO	The Applicant is conscious that technology is rapidly developing in this sector and where it has improved over the Scheme's operational lifetime, the Applicant would look to reflect these improvements when submitting its Decommissioning Plan. Prior to decommissioning, opportunities to minimise waste as far as possible will be explored. Possibilities to re-use or recycle materials will be explored before resorting to landfill options. There is a new industry emerging for recycling PV modules. This would be explored, in addition to any resale of any operational PV modules.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Debris from the solar farm must be recycled effectively and efficiently.	NO	Prior to decommissioning, opportunities to minimise waste as far as possible will be explored. Possibilities to re-use or recycle materials will be explored before resorting to landfill options. There is a new industry emerging for recycling PV modules. This would be explored, in addition to any resale of any operational PV modules. Waste during the decommissioning phase will be dealt with as part of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), which will be produced prior to decommissioning, and in line with relevant legislation and guidance at that time. The Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO is required to include a resource management plan that includes details of proposals to minimise the use of natural resources and unnecessary materials. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) is included in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	How will recycling plants cope with such a large number of solar panels?	NO	A Framework DEMP has been submitted as part of the DCO Application in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This requires the preparation of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP) is prepared in advance of decommissioning. This will consider the capacity of the recycling facilities to take PV modules at the time of decommissioning and would provide further detail on techniques and specific facilities which would be required in advance of the decommissioning stage, as it is not possible to accurately predict these details at this point given that decommissioning is proposed in 2065.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	A higher recycling % than 50% should be targeted.	NO	The Applicant will be seeking to recycle where feasible during decommissioning. Given the nature of the waste hierarchy, committing to a specific target of recycling only is challenging as some components are likely to be reused. Prior to decommissioning, opportunities to minimise waste as far as possible will be explored. Possibilities to re-use or recycle materials will be explored before resorting to landfill options. There is a new industry emerging for recycling PV modules. This would be explored, in addition to any resale of any operational PV modules. Waste during the decommissioning phase will be dealt with as part of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), which will be produced prior to decommissioning, and in line with relevant legislation and guidance at that time. The Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) is required to the DRMP. The Applicant will dispose of waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy. Opportunities to re-use material resources will be sought. If this is not possible, the Applicant will seek to recycle the components of the Scheme that can be recycled using today's technology. These include the PV modules, batteries, mountings, electrical infrastructure, cables and aggregates. The Applicant is conscious that technology is rapidly developing in this sector and where it has improved over the Scheme's operational lifetime, the Applicant would look to reflect these improvements.. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Why does it take as long to decommission the site as it does to install it?	NO	The effects of decommissioning are similar to, or often of a lesser magnitude, than construction effects. However, there can be a high degree of uncertainty at this point in time regarding decommissioning as engineering approaches and technologies are likely to change over the operational life of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. For the purposes of the Applicant's environmental impact assessment (EIA) activity it is assumed that the same timescales required for constructing the project will be needed to carry out the activities required to remove the infrastructure from the site. For assessments, the Applicant assumes the maximum impact in order to assess whether mitigation is required. A DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to the start of decommissioning works. Further details of the Framework DEMP submitted with the DCO application can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	12-24 months seems a short time to decommission such a large site.	NO	The effects of decommissioning are similar to, or often of a lesser magnitude, than construction effects. However, there can be a high degree of uncertainty at this point in time regarding decommissioning as engineering approaches and technologies are likely to change over the operational life of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. For the purposes of the Applicant's environmental impact assessment (EIA) activity it is assumed that the same timescales required for constructing the project will be needed to carry out the activities required to remove the infrastructure from the site. For assessments, the Applicant assumes the maximum impact in order to assess whether mitigation is required. A DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to the start of decommissioning works. Further details of the Framework DEMP submitted with the DCO application can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The company will not care to properly decommission the site as they will have already profited.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The DCO consent will require the person with the benefit of the Order at the time of decommissioning to be responsible for the decommissioning of the Scheme and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. The requirement to decommission the Scheme and implement the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) would be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Decommissioning should be done outside of peak travels and weekends.	NO	A DEMP will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved. Further details of the Framework DEMP submitted with the DCO application can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP. The DEMP submitted for approval will take account of technological changes prior to the start of decommissioning and will include detail of traffic movements.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The battery storage compound looks unsightly and a blot on the landscape.	NO	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges that the BESS will result in adverse visual effects once implemented. This has informed the Scheme design, with new areas of proposed tree planting around the BESS, so as to reduce the visual impact of the BESS. In addition, the colour tone of the BESS would be sympathetic to the colour tones of the landscape, so as to better integrate the BESS within the landscape.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The battery units will be visible for a very long time.	NO	The visibility of the battery storage units has been considered through the design process, such that they have been sited away from the villages and close to existing trees to reduce their visibility. The colour tone to the facade of the units will also be of a sympathetic colour to aid their integration within the landscape. The units will be visible at year 1 from several locations, as identified in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], but will reduce in the following years due to the establishment of the proposed planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Large battery compound will destroy the historical character of Burwell and turns that to an industrial zone.	NO	The Applicant is not proposing to locate a battery compound at Burwell. What is proposed is an extension of the existing National Grid substation. The Burwell National Grid sub-station extension is not covered by any statutory landscape designations and the existing compound is not publicly accessible. Any perception of the substation extension would be in the context of existing infrastructure present on the site, such as pylons and the existing substation, meaning the visual impact of the Scheme proposals are limited. The Applicant has addressed comments received in respect to landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Chapter 10.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	All fencing in the scheme (including during construction) should be of very muted colour; I suggest dark green (for temporary screening) or black (for permanent security).	NO	A description of the proposed fencing is outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 10I Outline OLEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Examples of both types of fencing used can be found on Plate 3-13 and Plate 3-14 within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES. The fencing proposed for the Scheme will consist of a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. Where required specific tree protection measures will be implemented, including fencing or solid hoardings and construction exclusion zones. This tree protection fencing will be rendered in a suitable colour to aid their integration in the landscape will then be located adjacent to the perimeter fencing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The boundary fence will have to balance the need to let sunlight fall and the requirements to 'visually mitigate' the panels.	NO	A description of the proposed fencing is included in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Examples of both types of fencing used can be found on Plate 3-13 and Plate 3-14 within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES. The fencing proposed for the Scheme will consist of a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height and is not intended to visually mitigate the PV modules. The visual mitigation will be via the retained vegetation and new planting as set out in the OLEMP (ES Appendix 10I)

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Use of different types of fencing on north and south sides will be appropriate.	NO	A description of the proposed fencing is outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and is considered in Appendix 10I Outline OLEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Examples of both types of fencing used can be found on Plate 3-13 and Plate 3-14 within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES. The fencing proposed for the Scheme will consist of a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. Where required specific tree protection measures will be implemented, including fencing or solid hoardings and construction exclusion zones. This tree protection fencing will be rendered in a suitable colour to aid their integration in the landscape will then be located adjacent to the perimeter fencing. The design of fencing will be the subject to approval by the relevant local planning authorities pursuant to a DCO requirement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Security and deer fencing are visually intimidating.	NO	A description of the proposed fencing is outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and is considered in Appendix 10I Outline OLEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Examples of both types of fencing used can be found on Plate 3-13 and Plate 3-14 within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES. The fencing proposed for the Scheme will consist of a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. Where required specific tree protection measures will be implemented, including fencing or solid hoardings and construction exclusion zones. This tree protection fencing will be rendered in a suitable colour to aid their integration in the landscape will then be located adjacent to the perimeter fencing. The design of fencing will be the subject to approval by the relevant local planning authorities pursuant to a DCO requirement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Solar farms are usually fenced to above head height for security. If bridleways or byways are alongside or through sites, care must be taken not to create a narrow corridor. It is not safe to fence users into to narrow a corridor, particularly for a length more than a few metres.	NO	Safety has been considered throughout the design of the Scheme. The Scheme will not create narrow corridors along bridleways or byways. There are ample set backs from bridleways and byways, and in the majority of cases there are not PV modules on either side of the bridleway or byway. For the U6006 there would only be PV modules on either side for a short section of the route and any fencing would be behind the existing vegetation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There is a lack of clarity around whether the height of the fencing is 2.5m or 3m and insufficient information around the proposed fencing of the BESS.	NO	A security fence will enclose the operational areas of the Sunnica East Site A, Sunnica East Site B, Sunnica West Site A, and Sunnica West Site B. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. The BESS and onsite substations will be located within these fences. This information is included in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There is substantial historic significance attached to the location and setting of these long-established gallops and training grounds. The landscape character of these areas is an historic one and is directly associated with the horse racing history. The character has remained unchanged in these locations for many years, partially because of its enduring supporting role to the global home of the racing industry, and partially because of its surrounding arable agricultural context.	NO	The Applicant recognises the importance of the Scheme location. The ES assessments include the potential impacts on cultural heritage (see Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) and the landscape and visual impact (see Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). The historic character of Newmarket has been recognised and assessed as part of the Applicant's assessment on cultural heritage and landscape and visual receptors.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The character and setting of the north east training grounds is of particular relevance given the proximity of the proposed solar photovoltaic panels that will be located at Sunnica West Site A. The site adjoins the principal gallops and training grounds located to the north east of Newmarket and forms part of their long-established landscape setting.	NO	The Applicant recognises the significance of the location and has held discussions with the owners regarding mitigation. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP, submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] to account for its location within this setting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Table 7.17 – Sunnica East B refers to views to the north of the Freckenham Conservation Area potentially being affected. This is more likely to be in views to the east, which will be dramatically changed to the detriment of the community.	NO	The visual impact from Freckenham Conservation Area has been fully assessed from all proposed sites. The Scheme is not anticipated to have a significant effect. Revisions to the Scheme boundary made by the Applicant since the statutory consultation, will further reduce the visual impact of the scheme on the Freckenham Conservation Area. This is through the removal of Parcel E07 from the Scheme, which will improve the relationship between Isleham and Freckenham.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will create interruptions in the landscape.	NO	The perception of any interruption in the landscape, due to new structures and change in land use will be reduced by the proposed planting, as shown in the Outline Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2]) as well as the Scheme being reversible, and land returned to agriculture.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The natural beauty of the open skied Breckland and Fen Borderland would be marred by the 2.5m high panels and the surrounding fencing.	NO	The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and has provided significant embedded mitigation and the open skied Breckland and Fen Borderland would not be marred. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The Scheme will ruin the gently undulating agricultural landscape.	NO	The Scheme will retain the underlying pattern of a gently undulating landscape beneath the PV modules. There will be change from agricultural land use, with new grassland beneath the PV modules.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The developers have at their consultations said that the land is flat, however, ordinance survey maps show contour differences of 8 metres and behind my home the land rises by up to 5m.	NO	Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the review of topography across the study area and the design of the Scheme has accounted for this.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Sunnica's Environmental Landscape Viewpoints map shows that even miles away in Ely all Sunnica sites will be visible.	NO	The viewpoints maps do not show this. The zones of theoretical visibility are based on no existing features, i.e. vegetation or buildings. The mapping does not take account of distance reducing visibility, as perceived by people and as per the title is 'theoretical'. The fieldwork, as set out in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], demonstrates the Scheme would not be visible from Ely.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The development will create a barren landscape with no wildflowers or creatures.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, and the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment submitted as part of the DCO application sets out how this will be achieved. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain was presented in Chapter 8 of the ES, published as part of the statutory consultation, alongside details of embedded mitigation measures. Additionally, Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) sets out our proposals for creating species-rich grassland and replacement arable fauna in the environs of the PV modules. We are proposing to sow a wildflower seed mix between the rows of PV modules following installation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	This Fenland area is defined by open swathes of land with wide, expansive skies. This openness provides a wonderful sense of freedom, tranquillity and wellbeing, and a sense of place. The sheer size of the Sunnica scheme would dramatically rewrite this landscape.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken extensive assessments of the landscape baseline within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant recognises the sensitivity of the existing landscape and mitigation is included to reduce the likely impacts of the Scheme, so that the landscape character is retained overall and effects are localised. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	This is an historic landscape of Rolling Estate Chalklands typology and the visual experience is one of open spaces with long views emphasised by straight roads and a regimented pattern of tree belts and hedge. Crop production is focused on field vegetables which has a significant impact on the landscape character whilst straight rows of hawthorn hedges or narrow belts of trees divide large fields.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken extensive assessments of the landscape baseline within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant recognises the sensitivity of the existing landscape and mitigation is included to reduce the likely impacts of the Scheme, which includes the retention of road networks and pine lines, trees dividing fields and long views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We want to look after the most unusual lowland landscape in the UK and one of the most important areas for wildlife.	NO	The Applicant recognises the significance of the rural landscape both for the people living there and to the image of the area. Understanding and appropriately mitigating the visual and environmental impacts of the scheme are important priorities for the design process. The Applicant has conducted a rigorous programme of environmental impact assessments prior to submitting its DCO application. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, and the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out how this will be achieved. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is presented in Chapter 8 of the ES alongside details of embedded mitigation measures. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) outlines the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management, and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Against the visual and environmental impact of solar farms generally on green spaces.	NO	Noted; the Scheme has included substantial mitigation to reduce the landscape impacts to the rural landscape. These are set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We would effectively be living within a building site and lastly within a solar farm which is unacceptable.	NO	The PV modules do not surround any properties and have been offset from the villages. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the predicted landscape and visual changes, including mitigation measures which have offset the PV modules from road networks to reduce the perception of the Scheme within the landscape. A CEMP will be implemented to manage any environmental impacts of construction activities. This is proposed to be a requirement of the DCO and will be in accordance with the Framework CEMP which is provided at Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The Scheme will industrialise an unspoilt swathe of rural Cambridgeshire and Suffolk.	NO	We do not consider that the Scheme as presented will industrialise the local area. An Alternative Sites Assessment has been submitted with the DCO Application in Appendix 4A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This, as well as the Alternatives chapter (Chapter 4 of the ES [EN010106/AP/6.1]) describes the process followed to consider alternative sites during the Scheme design development, and how the final Order limits were set. Ensuring sufficient distances from residents and communities formed part of the criteria in selecting the most suitable sites for the Scheme. A suite of specialist reports have been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include a full landscape and visual impact assessment alongside a landscape character assessment that have been undertaken regarding the Scheme. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Taking into account the feedback from the PEIR and the results of the specialist surveys and studies a suite of landscape mitigation measures and design changes have been proposed to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. This has included the removal of some areas previously suggested for solar use; the addition of 'set back' areas from field edges closest to human receptors and the introduction of a large amount of tree and grassland planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It is a substantial high-rise development in a rural community.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The main components (PV modules) are 2.5m in height, which is not high rise development. The BESS and sub-stations are taller, but at a maximum of 12m in height, can all be visually screened by new planting. The Applicant has addressed comments received in respect to landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The views over the Breckland landscape and the feel of the area will be changed forever.	NO	In relation to the extent of the Scheme, change to views over the Breckland landscape will be very localised and the proposed mitigation will reduce the predicted visual effects. The Scheme is reversible and will be removed from the landscape. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] should be referred to for further information.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The government's own impact statement for solar farms states that they should not be sited on flat land as they have a much greater negative impact.	NO	The siting of the scheme is considered appropriate in landscape and visual terms. The Scheme has been designed with regard to relevant legislation and policy relevant to landscape and visual amenity, which also acknowledges that planting can screen developments.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The Scheme does not give weight to landscape and visual impact.	NO	The Applicant's prediction of the landscape and visual effects is set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1] and sets out the relevant mitigation to address the likely impacts and effects. The Scheme design has therefore been informed by the landscape and visual impact and the Scheme therefore does give weight to this aspect of the environmental assessment. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] should be referred to for further information.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The landscape value in your assessment is described as medium. This does not reflect its true value to our community.	NO	The assessment methodology for value has been undertaken in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition and has been developed post consultation with the host authorities. The value is based on a number of criteria relevant to landscape matters, which include cultural heritage and perceptions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	You should be aware that Freckenham Parish Council is in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan which will be registered with the Local Authority next year. As part of the work undertaken to write the Plan, a Landscape Character Appraisal was conducted. This report determined that there are a number of key views affecting the Parish which developers and planners must consider before making any decisions. Some of these key views will be negatively impacted by the Sunnica East sites, and will be strongly resisted by the community.	NO	The Applicant is aware of these publications and they are included and taken account of in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The Golf Club and the course, both of which are world famous, share a common boundary with the proposed site of the development, which I am concerned will have an adverse environmental and visual impact on the course.	NO	The Scheme has been assessed to have a minor adverse impact on golfers at the Royal Worlington Golf Club. This is not considered significant and will comprise of a subtle change to the composition of the existing view. As planting matures, this is anticipated to reduce to a negligible adverse impact by year 15 of operation. Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting to the north and east of parcels E24 and E25 to screen the solar structures and additional hedgerow and woodland planting adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views for motorists and from views from the wider landscape to the north of parcels E30-32. The PV modules within parcels E26-29 have been offset from boundary vegetation to retain the landscape pattern and screen the PV modules from wider views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The size of your scheme will dramatically re-write the landscape, replacing the greenery and openness with fenced in fields of over 2 million industrial solar panels.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the predicted effects to the landscape character. The Scheme design incorporate measures to reduce the likely landscape effects so that the perception of the rural landscape remains.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The long views to and from Isleham will be lost	YES	Long views to and from Isleham will not be lost. Following consultation, the Applicant has revised the Scheme, with development no longer to the west of Beck Road. In combination with the offset of PV modules to the east of Beck Road, the open character of the landscape and the ability for long views from along this road will remain.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The rural aspect binds Freckenham, Chippenham and Worlington together and this will devastate communities	YES	The Applicant recognises the significance of the rural landscape both for the people living here and to the image of the area. Understanding and appropriately mitigating the visual and environmental impacts of the scheme are important priorities for the design process. The Applicant has conducted a rigorous programme of environmental impact assessments prior to submitting its DCO application. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. These changes mean that the rural relationship between the villages is retained.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will remove countryside making it brownfield land.	NO	The Scheme will be in operation for at least 40 years. Once decommissioned and infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production. Anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or development consent order application. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use. Details of the Draft DCO can be found within the DCO submission documents [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The Scheme will not involve the permanent loss of land. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of a Scheme's lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during a Scheme's operational lifetime. It is proposed that ecological enhanced areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by Sunnica Ltd. Sunnica Ltd will be required to abide by the DCO consent and legislation relevant at the time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We need to preserve our countryside for future generations.	NO	The Scheme will be in operation for at least 40 years. Once decommissioned and infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production. Anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or development consent order application. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use. Details of the Draft DCO can be found within the DCO submission documents [EN010106/APP/3.1]. A number of areas are set aside within the Order limits for embedded mitigation and planting. Within the solar development, we are also proposing planting around and below the solar arrays to benefit biodiversity. It is important to note that the Scheme will not involve the permanent loss of land. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of a Scheme's lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during a Scheme's operational lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The Scheme will destroy magnificent unspoilt English countryside and turn it into an industrial landscape.	NO	The Scheme has been designed to minimise the effect it will have on the countryside. The Scheme has sought to avoid ecological features and sites designated for nature conservation. Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impacts on ecology receptors and conclude there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. In addition, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual receptors and sought to reduce the potential effects of the Scheme through embedded mitigation which has been built into the Scheme design. With the mitigation measures in place the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the contention that the Scheme will industrialise the landscape.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We know we have no right to a view and this land could be developed in other ways- but we do need our open spaces.	NO	The Applicant acknowledges there is a visual impact from the PV modules and the Scheme design incorporates substantial new planting. In combination with retaining existing vegetation and offsetting PV modules from road networks, the visibility of the PV modules will reduce with the establishment of the planting. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides a full assessment of the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There is uncertainty around the depth of the proposed buffers between the external boundaries of the site and the PV arrays.	NO	The distance between the boundaries of the site and the PV modules varies due to the mitigation of new hedgerows, trees and grassland. Distances are illustrated on the plans in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There is a lack of clarity around the proposed ground levelling and where the spoil heaps from the cable routes will be located, as well as their height.	NO	Spoil material is expected to be generated from cable trenches, temporary and permanent compounds, internal roads, BESS and substation compounds, and solar stations. During construction the spoil will be stored temporarily within designated areas adjacent to the cable route and within the construction compounds. The spoil resulting from the construction of the Sites will be utilised to backfill the cable trenches, reinstate the temporary construction compounds and any temporary access roads. For the Sites, there will be no site wide reprofiling required; however, there may be a need to flatten areas within the Sites. This is unlikely to create excess spoil and it is not expected that this would need to be removed from the Sites. During the construction of the cable route, the total volume of excess spoil arising from earthworks is anticipated to be 45,470 tonnes. This is the volume to be displaced by the cables themselves (i.e. the volume remaining once the cable route has been backfilled), so will be removed from site and disposed of at an appropriate waste facility. Topsoil, spoil and other construction materials will be stored outside of the 1 in 100 year floodplain extent and only moved to the temporary works area immediately prior to use. The temporary storage of spoil within the Order limits is assessed in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], which sets out that there will not be significant adverse landscape or visual effects from the cable routes, once implemented. Launch and reception pits for trenchless cabling will be excavated using a suitable excavator, with any required shoring or battering installed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Plant and spoil will be placed a safe distance away from the edge of the excavation so as to minimise the risk of the trench sides collapsing. The trenches for the cable laying will be backfilled with existing material to match the existing ground levels and in winter appear similar to agricultural fields. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses that there will not be significant adverse landscape or visual effects from the cable routes, once implemented. The Applicant has provided this information regarding proposed ground levelling and location of spoil heaps in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Sunnica has provided photo montages of a select number of views. Like a dodgy estate agent's image that makes a small room look big, Sunnica has used a wide-angle lens to try to suggest their power plant will not have a visual impact on the landscape.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Visualisations have been prepared in accordance with the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals and represent 'Type 4' visualisations. The photography was undertaken via a digital camera to accommodate the necessary scope of the Scheme and relevant context. Full detail of the photomontage methodology is included as part of the ES, under Appendix 10C: LVIA Methodology. The Applicant has responded to the comments relating to the methodology behind the LVIA in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Plates 2.6, 2.7 showing the view from the corner of Sheldricks Road and Beck Road in Year 15 with planting are an example of the view that is lost. It would be useful to do these montages at year 5 and year 10 and during the winter periods to provide a more balanced approach. Why has this not been done?	NO	The operation phase has been assessed for two different years for the LVIA: the year 1 opening phase of the Scheme; and year 15 of operation of the Scheme, which will take in to account the establishment of the proposed vegetation, screening and planting. This is in line with national landscape and visual assessment guidance. The Applicant has responded to the comments relating to the methodology behind the LVIA in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The photomontages Plates 2.6, 2.7 showing the view from the corner of Sheldricks Road and Beck Road shows what appears to be a high fence. This is not referred to in the documentation so how is it taken into account in when assessing the visual impact.	NO	The fencing is a deer fence which is included in the consideration of the visual effects, as set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The photomontages don't show the impact of an industrial plant on our flat landscape.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The photomontages depict the Scheme, its associated structures and new planting in accordance with industry guidelines.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Some of the photomontages are inaccurate and some views are cut in half.	NO	The Visualisations have been prepared in accordance with the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals and represent 'Type 4' visualisations. Full detail of the photomontage methodology was included as part of the ES, under Appendix 10C: LVIA Methodology [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Additional images have been included to show the scheme all on 1 page.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There have been some important omissions such as from Freckenham towards the East B site.	NO	Viewpoint 17 has been included to assess this view.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The annotated photos are not clear or lack detail.	NO	The annotated photographs depict the key features in the view and the approximate extent of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The photomontages incorporating 15-year foliage growth show summer views rather than the worst-case scenario of winter visibility.	NO	The operation phase has been assessed for two different years for the LVIA: the year 1 opening phase of the Scheme; and year 15 of operation of the Scheme, which will take in to account the establishment of the proposed vegetation, screening and planting. This is in line with national landscape and visual assessment guidance. The Applicant has responded to the comments relating to the methodology behind the LVIA in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Winter year 1 views are also included in the photomontages.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	P18 of the consultation booklet – the gallops viewpoint – which photomontage is this please?	NO	The identified photomontage is Viewpoint 38: North from the Limekilns. This shows existing and visualisations for year 1 and 15 of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The consultation booklet admits only that the 'Users of the Gallops viewpoint' will be irrevocably changed; this is a far from comprehensive assessment.	NO	The consultation booklet (Appendix G-4) summarises identified landscape and visual impacts as a result of the Scheme. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] should be referred to for the comprehensive assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	WB1 The viewpoint from Park Farm Corner was agreed to be assessed by Andrew Jones but this was not done, therefore the visual impact has not been assessed or shown on any map.	NO	The view from Park Farm has been included in the visual assessment as receptor 42a. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] should be referred to for further information.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The grassland planting at East Site B is too close to houses on Newmarket Road, it should be pushed back.	NO	The Applicant has proposed grassland planting as part of its embedded mitigation. This will set back the solar infrastructure further from residential properties. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2], submitted as part of the ES).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There should be planting around the entrance to the Brookland.	YES	The Scheme has been revised following consultation and there are no PV modules to the west of Beck Road. PV modules to the east of Beck Road are offset from the road and set behind new tree planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	On the whole the Snailwell Gallops are well screened from the potential site by dense planting belts, but there is a portion where there is insufficient planting to significantly screen the site.	NO	The Applicant has held discussions with Snailwell Gallops in relation to the visual screening to address the identified portion. Details are provided in the Outline LEMP in Appendix 10I [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Mature trees should be used to provide effective screening in the early years.	NO	Mature trees are not being used as it is considered that they are unlikely to survive. Smaller trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be used instead as these are considered to have a far higher chance of survival. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. As this planting establishes from day 1, the softening and screening of views will therefore increase and occur prior to year 15. Year 15 is an assessment timeline for the Environmental Statement rather than a constraint to the growth of new planting; i.e. it is a requirement of the industry guidance for landscape and visual assessment to provide an assessment of the impacts in Year 15. The vegetation will still offer some screening in earlier years.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Creating a wide raised bund, suggested by the Sunnica team at Queens Hill would be a good idea and should form part of the proposal.	NO	This comment is noted and was considered following statutory consultation. However, the inclusion of a bund was not taken forward because it is considered that this would be uncharacteristic in relation to the gently undulating landform and open character of the rural landscape.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	E07 is on a slope that makes it almost impossible to put in place effective screening when viewed from Freckenham and should be removed.	YES	The Applicant has revised the Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for ecological mitigation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant has revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the Statutory consultation. An updated project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The proposed screening does not adequately conceal the solar panels from nearby homes, roads and lanes.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is a substantial extent of new planting across the Scheme to address potential visibility from homes, roads and lanes. This is in combination with the PV modules being offset from homes, roads and lanes and existing roadside vegetation retained where practicable. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes photomontages (before and after images) which demonstrate screening from new planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The proposed screening will take too long to grow.	NO	Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting which would range between 1m and 3.5m in height, in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height. As this planting establishes from day 1, the softening and screening of views will therefore increase and occur prior to year 15. Year 15 is an assessment timeline for the Environmental Statement rather than a constraint to the growth of new planting; i.e. it is a requirement of the industry guidance for landscape and visual assessment to provide an assessment of the impacts in Year 15. The vegetation will still offer some screening in earlier years. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	I am concerned that no trees or shrubs will be allowed above the cabling, which means the route will be clearly apparent for the whole of the Scheme's life.	NO	Vegetation will be allowed above the cable routes, so any vegetation removed during the construction phase can be replanted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	No amount of mitigation will disguise the proposed Scheme.	NO	The proposed planting can reduce the visibility of the Scheme and its perception from the surrounding landscape, in combination with the retention of existing vegetation. Trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be planted. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Will the battery compound be instantly screened until a natural habitat has grown up?	NO	The batteries will be housed within containers which will be rendered in a colour tone to aid in their integration within the landscape. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Would like to see additional tree planting to obscure East Site B from Barton Mills, especially along Golf Links Road.	YES	Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting to the north and east of parcels E24 and E25 to screen the solar structures and additional hedgerow and woodland planting adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views for motorists and from views from the wider landscape to the north of parcels E30-32. The PV modules within parcels E26-29 have been offset from boundary vegetation to retain the landscape pattern and screen the PV modules from wider views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	What is proposed in the interim to mitigate glint and glare impacts whilst vegetation is being established?	NO	We have proposed temporary screening in the form of solid hoarding along the site boundary to mitigate potential impacts on a small section of the A14. This will be removed once the density of vegetation is sufficient to screen the views. Our glint and glare assessment has identified no significant impacts on the remaining assessed ground-based receptors, and no further temporary mitigation requirement has been identified. The glint and glare assessment is presented in Appendix 16A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Given the prestige nature of Kennett Garden Village, Sunnica must ensure that mature screening is employed around the panels. Putting in vegetation screens at 2 ft high would take too long to grow and be effective.	YES	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design following the statutory consultation. There will be substantial boundary treatments on the eastern side of W15, which is the closest parcel to the site of Kennett Garden Village, with planting ranging between 1 to 3.5 m, to screen PV modules which are 2.5m in height. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It is unlikely that anything will cover the 33ft high substations.	NO	The siting of the substations within the Sites has taken account of where existing vegetation and new planting can provide screening. At Burwell National Grid Substation Extension, there would be new boundary woodland planting along the eastern edge of Option 1 and the western edge of Option 2. There would also be replacement planting along the Newnham drove where the vegetation is to be removed for cable route construction. These elements are set out in the Landscape Masterplan proposals, in figures 10-14a-f of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] and in the OLEMP. The options for the location of the Burwell National Grid Substation Extension are more constrained, as they have to be in proximity to the existing Burwell Substation. Significant effects are anticipated in year 1 of operation, before planting has had time to establish and mature, however the effects are assessed to be reduced by year 15 of operation, once planting has matured to screen the substations. The assessment on landscape and visual effects is provided in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The lighting and CCTV will not be covered by the screening.	NO	The lighting will be mostly infrared, and sensor operated, rather than permanent lighting. The CCTV will be visible until the establishment of the planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Sunnica should bear the associated costs for any screening.	NO	The construction, operation and maintenance of the scheme will be consented by way of requirements established by the DCO. It will include requirements for the Applicant to implement appropriate mitigation measures for the impacts identified by our environmental impact assessment activity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Hiding solar panels behind landscaping only further impacts the landscape.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and provided significant embedded mitigation. The strategy is to screen the PV modules via new planting which reflects the existing vegetation patterns and visual and landscape context. Further details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	E30, E31, E32 – a wider buffer/screening zone should be included alongside the road. Due to the topography of this field, a wide tall area of evergreen trees are needed to prevent unacceptable levels of visual impact on Barton Mills and the historic Royal Worlington Golf Club.	NO	Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views for motorists and from views from the wider landscape to the north of parcels E30-32. Trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be planted. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The western boundary of the heathland in E23 needs a tree screen to minimise views from this land to the solar panels beyond.	YES	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design following the statutory consultation. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located at E12 will additionally benefit from increased planting to screen from nearby receptors. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. Trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be planted. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Screening should be provided at the start of the scheme. This would at least allow the screening to become established during the 2-3 years it would take to construct the project.	NO	New planting will be implemented at the earliest opportunity to quicken the establishment of plants and screening of the PV modules and associated structures. Trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be planted. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The existing hedgerow along Freckenham Road, outside the scheme but again in the control of one of the landowners behind the scheme should be augmented to provide an 'instant' screen from the road.	NO	The infrastructure will be set back from Freckenham Road. Parcel E11 (please refer to Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement [EN01016/APP/6.3]) has been removed from development and will now be planted with native grassland as parcel ECO3 (shown in Figure 3-1 of the ES). This will increase the distance between Freckenham Road and Worlington residents from the infrastructure. E12 to the south of ECO3 will be lined to the north by hedgerow planting, which will further screen the views of the PV modules while retaining a more open view of ECO3 from Worlington and Freckenham Road. If consent is granted, the Applicant would control and be responsible for the maintenance of land within the Order limits. The Applicant would not have control of land outside of the order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	W10, W11, W12 – a wider buffer/screening zone should be included alongside the road.	YES	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design following the statutory consultation. Different landscaping treatments have been introduced along the W10 and W11 boundary to further screen these parcels. Additionally, on the adjacent side of the road, parcel W13 will no longer be built on and parcel W14 has been set back from residential properties in the area. In these areas the Applicant is now proposing additional landscaping to mitigate views. Details of proposed landscaping are set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The Sunnica team advised that the woodland planting would consist of trees ranging from 1 to 3 metres in height at the time of planting. We are aware that similar planting for the Dickersons quarry approximately 15 years ago has taken a considerable period to grow due to the harsh conditions, despite a maintenance plan being in place.	NO	This is noted and the submission included in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, which sets out proposed management of the new planting to ensure its establishment. Low growth rates have also been accounted for in the landscape and visual impact assessment. Mature trees are not being used as it is considered that they are unlikely to survive. Smaller trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be used instead as these are considered to have a far higher chance of survival. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. As this planting establishes from day 1, the softening and screening of views will therefore increase and occur prior to year 15. Year 15 is an assessment timeline for the Environmental Statement rather than a constraint to the growth of new planting; i.e. it is a requirement of the industry guidance for landscape and visual assessment to provide an assessment of the impacts in Year 15. The vegetation will still offer some screening in earlier years.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The solar panels will not be screened by trees or berms.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees and considers that trees (as well as hedgerows) will provide visual screening as demonstrated by the photomontages within the Environmental Statement. Berms are not proposed. The landscape planting is illustrated on the Parameter Plans provided in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be planted. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	E7 and E11 have insufficient Proposed new Hedgerow planting or infilling of existing vegetation to shield the Solar Arrays from the properties along Freckenham / Mildenhall and Fordham road. Totally infringes upon the visual amenity of these areas.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Parcels E11 and Parcel E07 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for embedded mitigation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We request that the maturity (height, width, depth and density) of trees in line of sight between Queens Hill and the proposed solar panels utilises a higher proportion of more mature trees (taller, wider, denser) to provide effective screening in the early years.	NO	This is noted and further detail included in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, which sets out proposed management of the new planting to ensure its establishment. Mature trees are not being used as it is considered that they are unlikely to survive. Trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be used as these are considered to have a far higher chance of survival. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. As this planting establishes from day 1, the softening and screening of views will therefore increase and occur prior to year 15. Year 15 is an assessment timeline for the Environmental Statement rather than a constraint to the growth of new planting; i.e. it is a requirement of the industry guidance for landscape and visual assessment to provide an assessment of the impacts in Year 15. The vegetation will still offer some screening in earlier years.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There must be an objective that with the maturity of the various varieties of living screening planted, none of the energy equipment or fencing in the scheme will be visible from human eye-level at any point adjacent to the perimeter of the scheme or from a public highway passing through it.	NO	It is an objective to screen the proposed scheme with new planting and the retention of existing planting where practicable. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. Further detail is included in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, which sets out proposed management of the new planting to ensure its establishment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	A poor, cheap and monotonous planting scheme is proposed, instead of including character trees to produce a realistic skyline.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The proposed hedgerow and tree planting has been designed to utilise native species of local provenance to improve their biodiversity value. Species of hedgerow will include Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>), Blackthorn (<i>Prunus spinosa</i>), Hazel (<i>Corylus avellana</i>), Holly (<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>) and Field Maple (<i>Acer campestre</i>). Trees within the order limits that cannot be retained will be replaced with native species (either the same species as the tree that has been removed or another suitable native species) to provide a realistic skyline. Further detail on planting is included in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The fields of E26, E27, E30, E31 and E32 in particular have no screening to mitigate what effectively is an ugly eyesore as thousands of acres of solar panels indeed are.	YES	Extensive mitigation and boundary treatments have been embedded within the Scheme to reduce its visual impact. This includes new woodland planting to the north and east of parcels E24 and E25 to screen the solar structures and additional hedgerow and woodland planting adjacent to Golf Links Road to screen views for motorists and from views from the wider landscape to the north of parcels E30-32. The PV modules within parcels E26-29 have been offset from boundary vegetation to retain the landscape pattern and screen the PV modules from wider views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	When natural screening has grown taller than the fencing within, that fencing could be removed.	NO	The Scheme will retain the fencing around the perimeter throughout its operational lifetime for security.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The setbacks from roads, paths and dwellings are far too small.	NO	The setbacks from roads, paths and dwellings vary in width and in combination with existing vegetation and new planting are considered appropriate to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The author seems to conveniently forget that trees lose their leaves in Autumn and don't get them back until Spring.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the Scheme's visual impact in relation to a number of different seasons. The operation phase has been assessed for two different years for the LVIA: the year 1 opening phase of the Scheme in winter; and year 15 of operation of the Scheme in summer, which will take in to account the establishment of the proposed vegetation, screening and planting. The LVIA assessed construction and decommissioning phases during winter. This is in line with national landscape and visual assessment guidance. The Applicant has responded to the comments relating to the methodology behind the LVIA in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Being the type of energy equipment within the scheme which will cover the greatest land area, it is fortunate that the "solar PV arrays" are relatively low in height and of slender form. It is therefore acceptable that these are partially visible during construction.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Whilst it is acknowledged that a limited tree screen is proposed, further land should be taken between Freckenham Road and the site to provide clumps of trees, therefore providing a more varied habitat that is less easy to remove in the future.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development. This will further reduce the visual impact of the Scheme from Freckenham Road. The additional space will be used for habitat mitigation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	More mature trees and hedgerows should be provided on the peripheries of the site and to protect public vantage points.	NO	Mature trees are not being used as it is considered that they are unlikely to survive. Smaller trees, between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height) will be used instead as these are considered to have a far higher chance of survival. Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The setback distances are questioned – some now seem to have been reduced to 5 metres, from the previous 20 metre setbacks in all cases.	NO	The setbacks from roads, paths and dwellings vary in width depending on the Scheme location and relationship to existing features, and in combination with existing vegetation and new planting are considered appropriate to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. The setback distances are illustrated on plans in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Native Grasslands will not grow tall enough to cover the panels surrounded with deer fencing; (lighting and CCTV).	NO	Native grassland is not proposed to screen the site, rather it is proposed to improve biodiversity and to setback the Scheme from receptors as a landscape offset. The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on the landscape and has provided significant embedded mitigation. Planting includes trees between 1 to 3.5 metres in height (in comparison to the top edge of a PV module at 2.5m in height). Views will be softened to varying degrees from day 1 of the scheme. This is due to the retention of existing hedgerows and trees, in combination with new planting. The Applicant has set out proposed landscaping in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES. CCTV poles will be up to 5m in height. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the Sunnica Energy Farm. Further information on this is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. During operation, permanent lighting with motion sensors will be installed within the substations and BESS compounds, providing a maximum of 50 lux. The lighting will therefore not be permanently on. Any night works required on the PV modules during operation will use mobile lighting towers. These measures are included in Appendix 16F Framework OEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Construction temporary site lighting, in the form of mobile lighting towers with a power output of 8 kilo volt-amperes (kVAs), will be required in areas where natural lighting is unable to reach (sheltered/confined

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			areas), and during core working hours within winter months. Artificial lighting will be provided to maintain sufficient security and health and safety for the construction site, whilst adopting mitigation principles to avoid excessive glare, and minimise spill of light to nearby receptors (including ecology and residents), outside of the Order limits as far as reasonably practicable. All construction lighting will be deployed in accordance with the following recommendations to prevent or reduce the impact on human and ecological receptors: a. The use of lighting will be minimised to that required for safe site operations; b. Lighting will utilise directional fittings to minimise outward light spill and glare (e.g. via the use of light hoods/cowls which direct light below the horizontal plane, preferably at an angle greater than 20° from horizontal); and c. Lighting will be directed towards the middle of the construction site rather than towards the boundaries. These measures are included in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has committed in the Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] to undertake updated species surveys prior to construction commencing to confirm the status of species identified. This will help inform mitigation measures such as the placement of lighting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Burwell Substation is already of a considerable size and extending it would be detrimental to its surroundings.	NO	The Burwell National Grid Substation extension is not covered by any statutory landscape designations and the existing compound is not publicly accessible. Any perception of the substation extension would be in the context of existing infrastructure present on the site, such as pylons and the existing substation, meaning the visual impacts of the Sunnica Energy Farm proposals are limited. The Applicant has addressed comments received in respect to landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It is acceptable that solar PV arrays are visible during construction.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Despite the significant changes to the red line, Sunnica West A would be a vast expanse of uninterrupted solar plant.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation which will further mitigate the visual impact of the Scheme. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. Parcels W13, W14 and W16 have been removed from development, with W15 reduced in size. Increased landscaping at W10, W11 and W12 is proposed, with additional planting to screen views. The extent of solar plant is not contiguous, with breaks either side of The Avenue and between W03 and W04.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will reduce the perceived openness of the landscape setting.	NO	The Applicant agrees that the landscape has an 'open' character, as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The change to this character, via the introduction of PV modules and associated structures is also acknowledged in Chapter 10 which predicts significant adverse effects to the landscape character at the Site level. The change to land use is also considered against the reversibility of the Scheme and the beneficial change to the land cover via new planting and grassland in comparison to the agricultural land use. Chapter 10 also sets out the mitigation measures which are embedded within the Scheme to ensure the impacts are localised and significant adverse effects are avoided to the wider area.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will blot the landscape.		Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the predicted effects to the landscape character and the change in land use is acknowledged as resulting in adverse effects. However, due to the mitigation it is predicted that these effects will be localised and the wider landscape character will remain. Within the areas of proposed solar development, there will be extensive areas of new grassland, which in combination with the extent of new planting are considered to be beneficial for the landscape character and opportunities for biodiversity and these will remain once the Scheme is removed, as the PV modules and associated structures are reversible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Ugly blue panels.		Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges the change in colour tone to the landscape as a result of the PV modules. However, due to the mitigation it is predicted that the visibility of the PV modules will reduce.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Nobody could regard a "solar farm" to be anything but ugly and security fencing will only add to the over-all impression of a forbidding glass desert.		The Applicant acknowledges there is a visual impact from the PV modules and the Scheme design incorporates substantial new planting. In combination with retaining existing vegetation and offsetting PV modules from road networks, the visibility of the PV modules will reduce with the establishment of the planting. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides a full assessment of the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Farmland will be replaced with ugly panels the size of double decker buses.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment, the PV modules are 2.5m in height and not the size of double decker buses. The Scheme will be in operation for at least 40 years. Once decommissioned and infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production. Anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or development consent order application. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use. The Scheme will not involve the permanent loss of land. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of a Scheme's lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during a Scheme's operational lifetime. It is proposed that ecological enhanced areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by Sunnica Ltd. Sunnica Ltd will be required to abide by the DCO consent and legislation relevant at the time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The visual amenity of the surrounding area will be lost.	NO	Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the predicted visual effects along with the proposed mitigation to reduce the visibility of the Scheme. With the establishment of the proposed mitigation, the ES predicts that the visual amenity will not be lost.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Destroyed views from the Gallops diminishing Newmarket's appeal as a premier horse racing town for which we rely on for thousands of jobs.	NO	The view from the Limekilns was assessed as Viewpoint 38. It is anticipated that due to the elevated landscape, most of the Sunnica West Site A is visible from the Limekilns, part of the Jockey Club training grounds. This part of the DCO site is seen in the context of the A14 and Newmarket railway which cross the valley floor and the mature vegetation along The Avenue. The Applicant has engaged with the Jockey Club throughout the design process and will continue to do so. It is not anticipated that the Scheme will have an impact on the horse racing industry.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The PEIR states the visual impact on the local community around Worlington is major adverse.	NO	The visual impact on the Worlington local community is not major adverse. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] predicts a range of visual effects and these decrease with the establishment of the proposed planting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The views between the villages will be destroyed.	NO	The views between villages will not be destroyed. The Scheme design has been revised following consultation and PV modules are not proposed to the west of Beck Road. In combination with the set back of PV modules to the east of Beck Road, views will remain between Freckenham and Isleham.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The view from the Limekilns will be affected.	NO	The view from the Limekilns was assessed as Viewpoint 38. It is anticipated that due to the elevated landscape, most of the Sunnica West Site A is visible from the Limekilns, part of the Jockey Club training grounds. This impact is assessed as moderate adverse, which is significant. The Jockey Club has been consulted throughout the design process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will have a negative effect on key views from the Devils Dyke across Burwell Fen.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed visual assessment which is included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Views from the Devil's Dyke are included in the assessment as receptors 58 and 59. There will be no negative effects in views from the Devil's Dyke due to the distance from the scheme and the intervening vegetation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will have a negative effect on key views from the north of Dalham Hall.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed visual assessment which is included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme will not be visible from the hills around Dalham Hall, which is 7km to the south-east of Sunnica West Site A. This is due to more elevated and wooded land between Dalham Hall and the scheme, including woodland in close proximity to Dalham Hall.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will have a negative effect on key views from the Icknield Way Trail.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed visual assessment which is included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Views from the Icknield Way will not be impacted, as the route is to the south of Newmarket and east of Red Lodge (3km from the scheme at its closest point).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The mock-ups of future views look good.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It will ruin historic views over Newmarket Heath.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed visual assessment which is included in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Views over Newmarket Heath will not be impacted by the Scheme, which is in the opposite direction, to the north-east of Newmarket.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The boring ranks of solar panels will turn the current vibrant landscape into a dead area, visibly industrial and totally unnatural.	NO	Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges the change in land use and character as a result of the Scheme. But the Scheme also proposed substantial areas of new planting, including grassland which will provide increased opportunities for biodiversity and vegetation structure to a greater extent than the existing arable land uses.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There will be a range of large industrial box-like structures varying in height from 3 metres to 6 metres, 10 metres and 12 metres at several very visible locations within the sites and accompanied in some places by boring office and control buildings.	NO	Substantial new planting has been included across the Scheme, which in combination with the retained vegetation and the colour palette of the buildings, will reduce the visibility of the proposed structures.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Burwell substation is already significant and we would like to see a visualisation from yourselves or National Grid of the substation in 2022 revealing the combined visual impact of all the feeds from the total amount of solar farms feeding into it.	NO	Visualisations for various viewpoints throughout the main Sites have been included in figures 10-90 to 10-102 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. These viewpoints have been agreed with the local planning authorities. Visualisations of the Burwell National Grid Substation Extension were not requested by the host local authorities and have not been undertaken. The photomontage methodology is derived from the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals, 2019.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We would like to see detailed proposals from yourselves or National Grid on mitigating the increased adverse visual intrusion associated with your proposal.	NO	At Burwell National Grid Substation Extension, there would be new boundary woodland planting along the eastern edge of Option 1 and the western edge of Option 2. There would also be replacement planting along the Newnham Drove where the vegetation is to be removed for cable route construction. These elements are set out in the Landscape Masterplan proposals, in figures 10-14a-f of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] and in the OLEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The effect on the views from the hills arcing around to the south of Newmarket were not mentioned.	NO	The visibility from the hills to the south of Newmarket has been set out in the 'Area of Search' provided in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We are concerned about the cumulative visual impact of solar farms in the flat open landscape of our neighbourhood.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the cumulative effects from the four sites and grid connection route of the Scheme and from other developments in the area on landscape and visual in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The proximity to roads of East Site A in open country would turn pleasant local journeys into trips through an industrial wilderness.	NO	The importance of the roads at Sunnica East Site A has been noted from the beginning of the Scheme design, with suitable setbacks provided from Beck Road, along with no development to the west of Beck Road. Substantial new planting is proposed around the boundaries of Lee Farm, in relation to Ferry Lane, to again screen the proposed Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	There is concern regarding glint and glare for equestrian users south of Sunnica West site A.	NO	Potential impacts of glint and glare on equestrian users, PRow and bridleway receptors were assessed as part of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme and the potential impact on observers using the surrounding PRow and horses and riders using the surrounding bridleways is assessed as not significant. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Arrays should be avoided where glare is likely to affect users of an equestrian route or an equestrian business.	NO	Potential impacts of glint and glare on equestrian users, PRow and bridleway receptors were assessed as part of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme and the potential impact on observers using the surrounding PRow and horse and riders using the surrounding bridleways is assessed as not significant. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Glint and glare from the solar panels will put at risk aviation, particularly Mildenhall and Lakenheath.	NO	The Application has assessed the Scheme's potential impact on glint and glare as part of the Environmental Statement (Appendix 16A [EN010106/APP/6.2]) submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. This has concluded that no impacts are possible for RAF Mildenhall as no solar reflections are predicted towards any of the scoped and assessed aviation receptors. No detailed modelling was recommended for RAF Lakenheath as no significant impacts are expected given the significant distance of the airfield from the Scheme. The Applicant has also assessed the potential of the Scheme to attract flocking birds to the area such that it might raise the risk of a bird strike. The Scheme will not create habitat that will attract significant numbers of flocking birds to the extent that they would pose a risk to aviation, and the Scheme is not located in area close to any large water bodies which may attract large groups of flocking birds. Further details can be found in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We are concerned that we will receive glare directly into our property.	NO	Potential impacts of glint and glare on residential receptors were assessed as part of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme and the potential impact on the surrounding residential properties is assessed as not significant. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Glare from solar panels could impact users of A11 and A14.	NO	Potential impacts of glint and glare on users of the A11 and A14 were assessed as part of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Only one effect was identified to road users along the A14 in the absence of mitigation; road users travelling in a south-westerly direction on a section of the A14 adjacent to Sunnica West Site A will have views of the PV modules for approximately 200m, with the potential for glint and glare. Although the road users would only be in the reflection zone momentarily, this is considered sufficient to result in a potential safety hazard and therefore mitigation will be provided for the road users travelling in a south-westerly direction in the form of a temporary solid hoarding that will be 2.5m in height. The hoarding would be located on a short section, approximately 300m, along the Sunnica West Site A boundary with a high percentage of evergreen (native and non-native) species planted adjacent to the temporary hoarding along the road side in line with the indicative planting strategy. With the hoarding in place, there will be no effects from glint and glare on the users of the A14 or A11.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Current solar panels in Burwell are a light source stretching 350 acres causing a plastic eyesore.	NO	Details of the planting proposed to screen the PV modules from view are provided within Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Potential impacts of glint and glare were assessed as part of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme and the potential impact on observers is assessed as not significant. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We note that the assessed facilities do not include those to the more northly and easterly extents of the Limekilns Gallops that will be impacted by the proposals and require the same level of assessment.	NO	The Glint and Glare Assessment undertaken on behalf of the Applicant has been undertaken by experienced specialists and has adhered to all relevant guidance, policy and stakeholder consultation when determining receptors for assessment. The Limekilns Gallops have been considered in the assessment and solar reflections from the Scheme have been found to not be geometrically possible. Solar reflections will therefore not be experienced by horses or riders at horse facilities. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The assessment notes that there would be no solar reflection geometrically possible from gallops in the area other than Snailwell and the British Riding School that have been identified, thereby that no impact would be possible. We would query this assessment in the absence of detailed information setting specifically from where this has been undertaken. Further, we note that a number of gallops to the east have been omitted which could be affected.	NO	The Glint and Glare Assessment undertaken on behalf of the Applicant has been undertaken by experienced specialists and has adhered to all relevant guidance, policy and stakeholder consultation when determining receptors for assessment. Solar reflections will not be experienced by horses or riders at horse facilities. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It seems logical to assume that the effects of glint and glare on equine and racing related land uses is likely to be a specialist matter which requires a specialist approach to assessment in respect of any possible effects in this area. There is no evidence of specialist involvement in this aspect of the glint and glare assessment.	NO	The Glint and Glare Assessment undertaken on behalf of the Applicant has been undertaken by experienced specialists at Pager Power, who specialise in glint and glare assessments for solar farms. Their assessment has adhered to all relevant guidance, policy and stakeholder consultation when determining receptors for assessment. Solar reflections will not be experienced by horses or riders at horse facilities when the proposed mitigation is taken into account. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The conclusion that any solar reflections would be 'significantly screened' does not go far enough to demonstrate that there would be no impact to horses or riders utilising these training facilities, particularly in view of the findings of the LVIA which state that the view of Sunnica West A from the Limekilns cannot be screened. The implications of such potential reflection could be harmful to everyday activities of the industry and does not appear to have had the detailed consideration it deserves at this stage.	NO	The Glint and Glare Assessment undertaken on behalf of the Applicant has been undertaken by experienced specialists at Pager Power, who specialise in glint and glare assessments for solar farms. Their assessment has adhered to all relevant guidance, policy and stakeholder consultation when determining receptors for assessment. Solar reflections will not be experienced by horses or riders at horse facilities. The Glint and Glare Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO application which is located in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The glint and glare assessment does not assess important local roads such as the road from the A11 Red Lodge junction to Worlington, which is very busy and dangerous and proposed to be in sight of the E24-29 solar panels.	NO	Assessments of potential impacts of glint and glare on road receptors were undertaken as part of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant has scoped out local roads where traffic volumes and speeds are likely to be low in accordance with the relevant guidance presented in Appendix D of the Glint and Glare Assessment (Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Any solar reflections from the Scheme experienced by a local road user would be considered low impact. Road receptor points are illustrated in Figure 5 of the Glint and Glare Assessment (Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme design, including the provision of screening until vegetation has matured for users of the A11, and no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Minor roads have not been assessed for glint and glare impacts including i. The road from Freckenham to West Row, after the junction with the Worlington to Isleham road. ii. The road from Worlington to Isleham, after it crosses the Freckenham to West Row road. iii. The road from the Red Lodge A11 junction to Freckenham.	NO	Assessments of potential impacts of glint and glare on road receptors were undertaken as part of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant has scoped out local roads where traffic volumes and speeds are likely to be low in accordance with the relevant guidance presented in Appendix D of the Glint and Glare Assessment (Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Any solar reflections from the Scheme experienced by a local road user would be considered low impact. Road receptor points are illustrated in Figure 5 of the Glint and Glare Assessment (Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). The Applicant has embedded mitigation measures within the Scheme design, and no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The assessment you have undertaken on the value of the landscape and the visual impact of the proposals is wrong. You have not considered valued views in full.	NO	The value of the landscape and views has been considered in full, in line with industry guidance, as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	How do you justify your visual impact assessment when for over 40% of the proposed timescale of the Scheme it will be, by your own assessment, not mitigated?	NO	The visual assessment is justified by industry guidelines which require a 'worst case' scenario assessment, which is the year 1 timeframe at winter. The year 1 timeframe is when the scheme is built out, but new planting is low in height. The siting and retention of existing hedgerows mitigates the visual impact of the Scheme for many of the identified receptors at year 1. Evidently, as predicted in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], there are also significant adverse visual effects from the visibility of the Scheme at year 1. Following the year 1 assessment, it would not be proportionate to assess the Scheme for every following year, but the visibility of the Scheme would reduce via the growth of the new planting and summer seasons, when both existing vegetation and new planting is in leaf. The year 15 assessment is a standard industry timeline for the Environmental Statement and is considered proportionate to the 40 year duration and covers the remaining 60% of the timescale.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It is our opinion that the author of the PEIR has completely misunderstood the gentle local landscapes in both Cambridgeshire and Suffolk and has failed to comprehend their significance historically, visually or as the settings for the villages and farms which these landscapes encompass.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has understood the local landscapes, as demonstrated by the inclusion of a local landscape character assessment within Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The judgements on the sensitivity of these local landscape character assessments has been informed by their value, which includes cultural (historical) association, aesthetic value, perception and their function, i.e. settings for villages.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	It is assumed that View 38 has been taken as a representative viewpoint only as extensive views of the Sunnica West A site exist from various parts of the Limekilns (not least further elevated land to the east of point 38).	NO	Yes, Viewpoint 38 is representative and was a location agreed with the host authorities.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The extent of intervisibility between the Limekilns and Sunnica West A cannot be represented by a single viewpoint without an appropriate weighting being attached to that viewpoint relative to others, and when assessing the overall level of harm which the Scheme will cause.	NO	The extent of visibility from the Limekilns is covered by viewpoint 38, along with observations from fieldwork.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The meandering and eccentric boundary of the selected site, gives rise to significant landscape, visual and residential amenity impacts, and is a matter that must be fully assessed in the PEIR.	NO	The Order limits are based on field patterns and defined features in the landscape. The landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme are based on the proposed development and the factors set out in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] which have been fully assessed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The PEIR includes insufficient information on the landscape and visual effects and consistently underestimates the impacts upon landscape character and visual receptors.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The submission includes sufficient information on the landscape and visual receptors, as set out in Appendix 10F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The impacts and effects to landscape and visual receptors are not underestimated, with the justification and supporting narrative also included in Appendix 10H of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The use of "very low" and "low" categories of landscape sensitivity suppresses the values of some categories giving an artificially low score to the landscape and visual impacts.	NO	The inclusion of these categories is suitable, as there are parts of the landscape which are of lesser sensitivity than others, and therefore subject to this classification. To negate this option from the assessment process would neither be representative nor in accordance with industry guidelines.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The proper assessment of intra-cumulative effects is very important given that there are effectively four sites which must be assessed both independently and collectively. The PEIR does not provide this level of analysis which is essential to a proper assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the proposals.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area in its cumulative assessment, which has been undertaken in each of the technical chapters of the ES and summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES. Appendix 5A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents the shortlist of cumulative schemes that have been considered in the cumulative assessment. All of the assessments in the ES have considered the impacts of individual sites and multiples sites together (alongside the cable corridor works).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	We would like to formally request a visibility impact assessment from our property, which should be included into the RVAA report. In the scoping report you show viewpoints 14&14a which is very near our house but is not a representative viewpoint of the high visual impact from our property. In addition, we do not agree with the assessment that the area & view is adequately screened by garden boundaries.	NO	The team did not visit residential gardens as the potential changes to views are being undertaken from publicly accessible locations. Topography is also judged via these site visits, as well as via reviews of mapping. This approach is standard industry practice for the assessment of visual effects, and the publicly accessible locations are considered suitable and accurate for ascertaining the resident's views. The RVAA is included in the assessment methodology should it be required where a residential receptor is predicted to experience significant adverse effects at year 15 of operation. However, as set out in the landscape and visual assessment, none of the residential receptors are predicted to experience a significant adverse effect at year 15 and therefore a RVAA is considered not to be required. The landscape and visual assessment is set out in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.1] and it is considered that a reasonable and proportionate assessment of the likely change to residents' views is included within the assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Wildflowers should be encouraged around the solar panels so the environment will benefit.	NO	Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES sets out our proposals for creating species-rich grassland and replacement arable fauna in the environs of the PV modules. The Applicant is proposing to sow a wildflower seed mix between the rows of PV modules following installation. Such appropriate mixes include EM3 – Special General Purpose Meadow Mixture or EM2 –Standard General Purpose Meadow Mixture. Beneath the PV modules, bare areas created during construction will be re-seeded using a mix of native grass and wildflowers.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The proposals fail to deliver a vision for how the scheme will provide realistic, long-term enhancements for biodiversity on a landscape-scale. These should link with important retained habitats, support existing local conservation initiatives, and build on nature recovery networks, in order to demonstrate clear and bold aims for biodiversity that would be proportionate to the size and scale of the development proposals.	NO	The Scheme has incorporated the principles of enhancements for biodiversity on a landscape scale. This is enshrined through measures presented in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], alongside details of embedded mitigation measures. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The scheme is too concentrated in one mass which will harm biodiversity.	NO	The Scheme is dispersed across four main sites. The Scheme design has embedded significant mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. By creating new and enhancing existing habitats, this will help to create a more complex ecosystem which in turn will improve the stability of the populations of species within the Site and those 'spilling in' from the surrounding areas. The types of habitat that are proposed to be created / enhanced throughout the Sunnica East and West Sites include: biodiverse grassland, marshy grassland, nesting plots for Stone Curlew, woodland and hedgerow planting. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. Other areas of habitat will be managed for overwintering and breeding birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We are not convinced that Sunnica can provide a net gain to our already well-established Biodiversity. Mitigation is not a compromise that we are prepared to accept on behalf of the total Disorientation of Biodiversity it poses to the area.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, see Chapter 8: Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. A biodiversity net gain analysis is included within the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the principle is enshrined through the measures in the Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] which will be secured through the DCO (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Stone Curlews cannot nest under solar panels and their numbers will reduce.	YES	We have conducted surveys to identify Stone Curlew nesting sites. This has informed the design of the Scheme. Taking into account the results of these surveys, parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional Stone Curlew habitat. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide further habitat. These revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It should also be noted that E11 is a nesting site for Stone Curlew and other protected species.	YES	Parcels E11 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for Stone Curlew habitat. Revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The long-term presence of nesting Stone Curlews on the western boundary of Worlington has not been properly considered.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for Stone Curlew habitat. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide further Stone Curlew habitat. These revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. Our approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	These habitats include the remains of Worlington Heath, (around E23 on the map), an area containing rare plants and important to nesting bird populations. There does not appear to be any logical reason for disturbance in the vicinity of this grassland, even within the Scheme as presented.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Parcel E23 is no longer proposed for solar development and existing habitats will be retained.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The village of Worlington has had an active project to increase swift numbers. Has the impact on these birds been properly assessed? What impact will the vast area of solar arrays have on bird flight patterns and migratory paths?	NO	The Scheme is not anticipated to impact on swifts. Swifts are included as a priority species in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plans and therefore potential impacts of the Scheme on Swifts were assessed. The Breeding Bird Survey Report found that there are no Swift territories within the Scheme. This is laid out in Table 4-2 of Appendix 8I [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 8 in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What impact will the vast area of solar arrays have on bird flight patterns and migratory paths	NO	The Applicant has considered the effects of PV modules and associated infrastructure in response to comments received after submission of the Scoping Report. The Scheme will not create habitat that will attract significant numbers of flocking birds that may pose a strike risk for aviation. The site also is not on a path connecting areas supporting significant numbers of birds that pose a risk to aviation, e.g., waterbirds. It is considered highly unlikely that the Scheme would have any effect on the numbers and frequency of bird flights overhead. This is set out in Chapter 8: Ecology of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Section 8.6 of this chapter which sets out ornithological baseline conditions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The habitat areas proposed for Stone Curlew mitigation are insufficient.	YES	We have conducted surveys to identify Stone Curlew nesting sites. This has informed the design of Sunnica Energy Farm. Taking the results of these surveys into account, the Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for Stone Curlew habitat. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide further habitat for the species. These revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Birds of prey will not be able to hunt due to the solar panels.	NO	The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. The Scheme will be managed and enhanced for arable flora, which will benefit a range of wildlife, including the prey of birds of prey such as terrestrial invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles; small mammals (such as voles), and both foraging and ground-nesting birds which will provide foraging habitat. Leaving rough areas of grassland margins, which will benefit small mammals, will provide foraging habitat for Barn Owls. The Applicant has set out how this will be achieved in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The wildlife surveys have missed out Lapwings and Oystercatchers that we regularly see on the grassland.	NO	Oystercatchers and Lapwings were assessed as part of the Breeding Bird Survey Report, which is included in Appendix 8I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Territories were found for both specie within the Scheme, which is detailed in Table 4-2 of the Breeding Bird Survey Report. There will be no significant effect on Lapwings and Oystercatchers as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The PEIR and OLEMP have not detailed Skylark mitigation, which is concerning due to the high numbers of Skylark breeding territories across all sites, identified in Appendix 8H (Breeding Bird Survey Report).	NO	Impact avoidance and embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design. This includes land to be managed as biodiverse grassland which is suitable for Skylark. This is included in Chapter 8 [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the ES, and Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] details how this will be achieved. There will be no significant effect on Skylarks as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	You will destroy migration routes for birds.	NO	The Scheme will not create structures that will impede migrating birds. It is considered highly unlikely that the Scheme would have any effect on the numbers and frequency of bird flights overhead.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Which organisations will be involved in setting up and maintaining the 3 sites for Stone Curlews?	NO	The construction, operation and maintenance of the scheme will be consented by way of a DCO. It will include requirements obliging the Applicant to implement the management of the appropriate mitigation measures for the impacts identified by our environmental impact assessment activity, including in relation to Stone Curlew. Standard environmental best practice and mitigation will be implemented to ensure construction and operation of the Scheme complies with legislation relating to protected species. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The RSPB is concerned about the potential impacts of this scheme on breeding Stone Curlews. The solar farm is likely to have a significant effect on Stone Curlews nesting within the area shown in the plan as Sunnica East.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for Stone Curlew habitat. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide further habitat for the species. These revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. Our approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through habitat surveys and engagement with relevant stakeholders including Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	New research (manuscript under review and to be published very soon Hawkes et al.) has shown Stone Curlews travelling up to 5km from nesting locations to feed, and RSPB observations of colour-ringed birds from the Sunnica East site shows that Stone Curlews do move between the proposed development site and the Breckland SPA, which includes birds originating from the SPA breeding at the development site in subsequent years (5 birds originating from the SPA have been recorded at Sunnica East including 3 breeding, and 7 birds originating from Sunnica East have been recorded in the SPA including 1 breeding). We conclude therefore that the proposed development site is functionally linked to the SPA, that there is a likely significant effect on the SPA, and therefore that full HRA is required.	YES	At the time of the Habitats Regulation Assessment undertaken by the Applicant, the Stone Curlew population within the Order limits was not considered functionally linked with the Breckland SPA population. The Applicant accepts this new research and a Habitats Regulations Assessment: Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment accompanies the DCO submission, provided in Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We are pleased that site clearance is proposed to take place outside breeding season, described as March- August inclusive (Appendix 10I 6.10.2). It should be noted though that Stone Curlews have a long breeding season and chicks from late nesting attempts may not fledge until the middle of October. Therefore, we recommend that site clearance should not take place between March and 15th October.	YES	This is noted and the measures proposed in the vicinity to breeding Stone Curlew have been revised. Construction will be phased so that areas within 500m of the new habitat provisions are developed outside the Stone Curlew breeding season of March to October and that the replacement provisions are ready for use by Stone Curlew by the breeding season at the start of construction. With these measures in place it is considered that no construction-related disturbance of nesting Stone Curlew would occur. A Habitat Regulations Assessment: Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Appendix 8M of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) has now been undertaken. Further details are also provided in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is essential that cleared areas are monitored for Stone Curlews (and other ground nesting birds) prior to the start of construction works and that work ceases if nests are present.	NO	This is noted and the approach to the creation of Stone Curlew habit is set out in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the offsetting habitat provision for Stone Curlews specification that is secured by a DCO Requirement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We support the proposed mitigation to retain the majority of hedgerows, but whilst this is beneficial for species such as yellowhammer, thought and provision is also needed for species like lapwing which avoid more enclosed spaces.	NO	Impact avoidance and embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design. This includes land managed for as biodiverse grassland, which is suitable for breeding farmland birds, including Lapwing. This is included in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] details how this will be achieved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	3 species of owl - Tawny, Bawn and Little - habit the village and will have their homes destroyed	NO	Owl species are identified and assessed as part of the Breeding Bird Survey Report, which is included in Appendix 8I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Breeding sites will be retained and there will be no significant effect on Owls as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	This year particularly buzzards regularly have circled overhead.	NO	Buzzards were identified and assessed as part of the Breeding Bird Survey Report, which is included in Appendix 8I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. There will be no significant effect on Buzzards as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It has been suggested that maintenance of the site will necessitate 'cutting' the grass on two or three occasions each year. Will the operators refrain from so doing during the nesting seasons of birds?	NO	There will be avoidance of the nesting bird period i.e., March to August (inclusive) for vegetation clearance wherever possible. Any vegetation clearance proposed within the nesting bird period will be checked for the presence of any nests by a suitably qualified ornithologist, prior to vegetation removal, and if active nests are found, then appropriate buffer zones would be put in place and the area monitored until the young birds have fledged. This approach is laid out in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Framework CEMP and Framework OEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What impact will the vast area of solar arrays have on bird flight patterns?	NO	The Scheme will not create habitat that will attract significant numbers of flocking birds or create structures that will impede bird flight. It is considered highly unlikely that the Scheme would have any effect on the numbers and frequency of bird flights overhead.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	In fields to the back of us we see Stone Curlews, Lapwings, Buzzards and Barn owls. Eider ducks, Egyptian geese and Golden eye ducks also rest there during their migrations- all this will be lost as with solar panels in place there will be no obvious fields to land on.	NO	No significant residual effects on ecology (including the mentioned species) are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. Impact avoidance and embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] details how this will be achieved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It will disturb declining bird species such as Corn Bunting and Yellow Wagtail.	NO	Corn Bunting and Yellow Wagtail were identified and assessed as part of the Breeding Bird Survey Report, which is included in Appendix 8I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Breeding sites for Corn Bunting and Yellow Wagtail were found within the Scheme, which is detailed in Table 8I-7 of the Breeding Bird Survey Report. The Scheme has been assessed to have no significant effect on Corn Bunting or Yellow Wagtail.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	I could not find reference to habitat replacement requirements for Yellow Wagtail, Corn Bunting and potentially Turtle Dove.	NO	The Scheme has been assessed to have no significant effect on Corn Bunting, Yellow Wagtail or Turtle Doves, therefore, no specific habitat replacement is required. Impact avoidance and embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which will include grasslands and field margins suitable for Yellow Wagtail and Corn Bunting and additional hedgerow and tree planting which benefit Turtle Dove. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] details how this will be achieved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Birds migrate to and from their established breeding grounds for specific reasons, namely safety and food source. Maintaining cleared ground in a disturbed state to discourage ground nesting birds is an infringement upon their right to nest.	NO	Permanent habitat loss has been minimised as far as reasonably practicable, with hedgerows and woodland areas retained, meaning the majority of wintering bird species will not be affected. The loss of any arable habitat, which in turn will lead to the displacement of wintering bird species reliant on this habitat, will be avoided as much as practicable and mitigated through the retention of existing grassland/cover crops and undeveloped mitigation areas. There will be avoidance of the nesting bird period i.e., March to August (inclusive) for vegetation clearance wherever possible. Any vegetation clearance proposed within the nesting bird period will be checked for the presence of any nests by a suitably qualified ornithologist, prior to vegetation removal, and if active nests are found, then appropriate buffer zones would be put in place and the area monitored until the young birds have fledged.. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] which will be secured through the DCO, sets out the measures proposed to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on biodiversity (and landscape) features, and to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value of the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	All raptors: buzzards, kites, falcon, harriers, hawks plus owls need open fields to catch small prey like rats mice voles. They need trees to roost and make nests.	NO	Existing woodland and boundary features such as hedgerows will be retained. A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. By creating new and enhancing existing habitats, this will help to create a more complex ecosystem which in turn will improve the stability of the populations of species within the Site and those 'spilling in' from the surrounding areas. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] details how this will be achieved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Development of the site is likely to have a significant impact on ground hunting birds, such as Marsh Harriers.	NO	Marsh Harriers are identified and assessed as part of the Breeding Bird Survey Report, which is included in Appendix 8I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. No breeding sites for Marsh Harriers were found within the Scheme, which is detailed in Table 4-2 of the Breeding Bird Survey Report. The Scheme has therefore been assessed to have no impact on Marsh Harriers.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Birds and bats will fly into solar panels; birds are attracted to the panels in the spring/summer due to the warmth of the panels; the warmth above the panel attracts insects which in turn, attracts birds.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the effects of PV modules and associated infrastructure in response to comments received after submission of the Scoping Report. There is no evidence to suggest that birds or bats will collide with PV modules.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	This area is on the flight path of migrating wild swans and geese seeking wetlands shelter and grazing. From their bird's eye view the solar panels will look like a large lake. How will you prevent them crash landing?	NO	The Applicant has assessed the effects of PV modules and associated infrastructure in response to comments received after submission of the Scoping Report. The Scheme will not create habitat that will attract significant numbers of flocking birds that may pose a strike risk for aviation. It is considered highly unlikely that the Scheme would have any effect on the numbers and frequency of bird flights overhead. This is set out in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Section 8.6 of the chapter which sets out ornithological baseline conditions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Stone Curlews and their habitats are protected under national and European legislation [The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), as amended by The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000), Annex 1 of EC Birds Directive and Appendix II of the Berne Convention]. Under this legislation, they are specially protected (Schedule 1), and it is an offence to recklessly disturb breeding Stone Curlew.	YES	The Scheme has been designed having regard to relevant legislation and policy relating to the protection and conservation of habitats and species. There is anticipated to be no significant adverse effects on Stone Curlews throughout the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What will happen if these plans to lay cables are prevented because they run into legislation protecting certain red list species such as Stone Curlew?	NO	The Scheme has been designed having regard to relevant legislation and policy relating to the protection and conservation of habitats and species. There is anticipated to be no significant adverse effects on Stone Curlews throughout the Scheme's lifetime. The cable corridor for the Scheme is appropriately wide to enable the Applicant to deal with constraints if they were to arise.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Getting rid of brownfield sites is not environmentally friendly.	NO	The Scheme is not located in brownfield land.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Cable laying under the Kennett river should not have an environmental impact.	NO	Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects on species prior to and during construction. This will be outlined in the CEMP. The Framework CEMP is presented in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The use of drilling underneath the base of the watercourse to a depth of at least 2m will be used. The crossing of watercourses such as the River Kennett will be undertaken using boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods, with appropriate setbacks from the top of the banks (depending on habitats and other individual ecological constraints). The embedded mitigation measures, and details of which watercourses would be crossed by intrusive and non-intrusive techniques is included in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP6.1]. As a result of these measures, no significant impacts from such activities are predicted to arise.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Much of the farmland is devoid of life due to intense farming methods so the site should benefit.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Sunnica development is a kind to the logging companies destroying the rain forest.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The ecological impacts have been assessed within Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The report finds the opposite result to that which typically is perceived to arise from logging companies destroying the rainforest. The Applicant perceives that there will be biodiversity net gain resulting from the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We all recognise the importance of wildlife, but you just want to prioritise your profits.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The ecological impacts have been assessed within Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant perceives that there will be biodiversity net gain resulting from the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	I'm anxious about the welfare of wildlife and the preservation of their habitats. As long as that is high on your priority list, I'm cool.	NO	The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. This is enshrined through measures outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES). The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	May lead to extinction in these parts of Suffolk/East Cambs.	NO	This is not the case. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, and the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out how this will be achieved (see Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation). No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Presumably all of the construction process will be required to meet the conditions and requirements of the Local Authority and Natural England.	NO	A CEMP will be implemented to manage any environmental impacts of construction activities. This is proposed to be a requirement of the DCO and will be in accordance with the Framework CEMP which is provided at Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A LEMP will also be implemented and this is proposed to be a requirement of the DCO and will need to accord with outline LEMP provided in Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Local Planning Authorities in consultation with statutory bodies such as Natural England (where necessary) will approve these plans.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The benefits of the Scheme are outweighed by the impact on wildlife and the local area.	NO	We respectfully disagree with this assessment. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning within the Scheme's lifetime. A variety of measures are embedded within the Scheme proposals to improve the existing habitat for species already present in the area. We are aiming to improve habitats to increase the range of species already present and to increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. This will help integrate the Scheme within the context of the existing landscape and prevent and reduce any adverse effects on the ecology of the site. A variety of habitats have been included within the Scheme design as embedded mitigation to further increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The loss of fields/wildlife impact is negligible compared to the effects of global warming.	NO	This is noted. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in GHG emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It would be of some small comfort to have some legally binding contract to know that the land could be returned not just to farmland, but to be re-wilded, in a similar way to that proposed as part of The Great Fen project, and Sunnica could make a contribution to British ecology	NO	Anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or development consent order application. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use. Details of the Draft DCO can be found within the DCO submission documents [EN010106/APP/3.1]. A DEMP will need to be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. Details of this can be viewed at Appendix 16E: Framework DEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. It is proposed that ecological enhancement areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of this land and it may be returned to agricultural use.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Brecks environmental area will be lost, and this is not recognised in the consultation.	NO	The Applicant is aware that there are a number of sites close to the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm that are designated for their ecological significance, including Chippenham Fen and the Breckland Special Protection Area. The Scheme will aim will be to create a net improvement in biodiversity through mitigation measures. The Breckland SPA is approximately 1.4km to the north-east of the Sunnica East Site B. Construction activities are unlikely to affect the SPA directly given distance between the Order limits and the designated site. Appendix 8M Habitat Regulations Assessment: Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] has assessed the effect of the Scheme on European designated sites. The following measures identified in this appropriate assessment are to be implemented during construction and decommissioning in order to ensure no adverse effects on integrity: a. A CEMP and DEMP containing mitigation measures for construction dust on Fenland SAC/Chippenham Fen Ramsar and construction disturbance to Stone Curlew associated with Breckland SPA and its implementation; and b. The delivery of habitat to offset the loss of breeding habitat for Stone Curlew. 8.1.2 Following the implementation of the mitigation noted above it is concluded that the Scheme would have no adverse effect on the integrity of any European sites alone or in combination with other projects and plans.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			8.1.3 There are no residual effects that would constitute an adverse effect on the integrity of European Sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Worlington Heath from U6006 Badlingham Lane towards Freckenham Road is an ecologically important area.	YES	There is potential for protected and notable plant species to occur within the Sunnica East Sites A and B, with areas of botanical interest potentially associated with habitats on and near the Worlington Heath and Badlingham Lane CWSs to the south of Worlington. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Parcel E23 is no longer proposed for solar development and existing habitat will be retained.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The West site is too close to Chippenham Fen and will destroy wildlife habitats there.	NO	The Applicant is aware that there are a number of sites close to the Scheme that are designated for their ecological significance, including Chippenham Fen. The Scheme will aim will be to create a net improvement in biodiversity through mitigation measures. No direct habitat loss within Chippenham Fen will occur as a result of the Scheme. However, without mitigation, there is a risk that it would be affected by dust deposition and increased air pollution during construction. This effect can lead to habitat degradation and changes to communities' structure and function by affecting key species. Standard environmental protection measures will be therefore implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP (A Framework CEMP is included at Appendix 16C as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) will detail how this will be achieved, and these measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, indirect effects to designated sites during construction will not occur and there will be no effect to the integrity of Chippenham Fen.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	How can you guarantee not to affect the Chippenham Fen habitat during construction or with your sites draining into the wetlands?	NO	Standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP (A Framework CEMP is included at Appendix 16C as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]). Such measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, indirect effects to designated sites during construction will not occur and there will be no effect to the integrity of Chippenham Fen.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Snailwell Fen may be affected.	NO	There are no significant ecological impacts identified on Snailwell Fen.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Fordham Woods may be affected.	NO	There are no significant ecological impacts identified on Fordham Woods.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The East site A is located too close to two popular and established nature reserves.	NO	The Applicant is aware that there are a number of sites close to the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm that are designated for their ecological significance, including Chippenham Fen and the Breckland Special Protection Area. The Scheme will aim will be to create a net improvement in biodiversity through mitigation measures, see Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has identified and assessed the impact on statutory designated nature conservation sites within a 10km radius of Sunnica East Site A and no adverse effects are anticipated to occur.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Damage to flora and fauna during construction.	NO	A range of 'standard' or best practice mitigation and construction management measures are accounted for in the assessments presented within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and these will be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out the measures proposed to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on biodiversity (and landscape) features, and to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value within the Order limits. The Framework CEMP included within Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] will be required to take into account measures contained within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The long-term impacts to the environment are unclear.	NO	The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in GHG emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime. Monitoring will also be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] are being achieved. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the DCO submission and included within the finalised LEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	These schemes are destroying the environment we are trying to preserve.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in GHG emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The environmental benefits are staggering.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Keep ecological disruption to a minimum.	NO	No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The damage to the environment will be enormous throughout all stages of the Scheme.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in GHG emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The scheme is not an environmentally friendly scheme.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in GHG emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Make biodiversity and ecological enrichment a priority in planning and undertaking.	NO	The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. This will be enshrined through measures outlined in the final LEMP, following the principles outlined within the Outline LEMP included in Appendix 10I [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It would cause irreversible damage to the area's environmental equilibriums.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in GHG emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There will be losses of County importance arable and acid grassland habitats.	NO	Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has identified a loss of 0.8ha of semi-improved acid grassland in Sunnica East Site B. Land has been embedded within the Scheme for the reversion of 30.9ha of acid grassland from arable farmland. Significant areas of dry acid grassland will be retained and their quality improved (through positive management and embedded in the Scheme's Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, which will mitigate in the short-term for the loss of other areas of acid grassland and whilst mitigation areas develop. Retained grassland present within the DCO site will be protected during construction with security fencing established at an early stage to protect against incursion during construction. Mitigation plots will be created in existing fields supporting notable arable flora in field margins. Suitable management, such as through regular ground disturbance, will be implemented to support arable flora during the operation of the Scheme. Details on habitat management during operation are provided in Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Compacting land may damage wildlife habitats.	NO	This is not proposed as part of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There is a lack of detail on the creation/restoration of habitat throughout all phases of the project, especially after decommissioning.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has included proposals for habitat creation and restoration within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) which will be secured through the DCO, sets out the measures proposed to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on biodiversity (and landscape) features, and to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value within the Order limits. The requirement to produce a DEMP will additionally be secured through the DCO. A Framework DEMP is provided within Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It will damage wildlife habitats.	NO	It is predicted that the Scheme design has embedded significant mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime. Habitats temporarily lost or damaged during construction would be fully reinstated on a like-for-like basis at the same location on completion of construction works, where practical. Some habitats would be restored and managed with the aim of increasing their biodiversity value in the long-term as set out within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. As a result, no significant effects are predicted from loss of habitats. This is shown in Table 8-11 in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We request that the Scheme is redesigned to avoid valuable habitats.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation, having regard to responses on potential impacts on habitats and species. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional foraging space for bird species.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Query how the proposed created/restored acid grassland habitats will be managed in the long term as this is not currently specified in the LEMP.	NO	Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] outlines approaches to the management of dry acid grassland (8.1.1-8.1.9). Management would aim to maintain a sward height of 1 to 5 cm with approximately 15% bare ground. This would be achieved through low intensity grazing, either naturally by rabbits (where present) or by livestock such as sheep or cattle. If not cutting could be undertaken in late summer with arisings removed. Shallow rotavating may also be used to create bare areas in the absence of grazing. Management of created and restored grassland habitats will be finalised in the LEMP. This will outline the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Solar Array E23 in Sunnica East B should be removed from the scheme as it would have a direct impact upon U1 acid grassland and also have a significant fragmentary effect on the overall block of this habitat.	YES	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation. Parcel E23 is no longer proposed for solar development. In addition, Parcel E11, adjacent to E23, is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for grassland habitat.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The route of cabling across the fields and the extension to the substation are very close to areas of important habitats for wildlife, significantly Wicken Fen. As you will be aware this is National Trust land, the reserve having many rare species and construction will have an impact on these and many other species.	NO	The Applicant is aware that there are a number of sites near to the Scheme that are designated for their ecological significance, including Wicken Fen Ramsar. It has been assessed that the construction of the Scheme will not directly impact on habitat within this designated site due to the distance between Wicken Fen and the Scheme, see Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation included as part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] for further information.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Proposed ecological mitigations seem to assume the species involved will relocate seamlessly to the alternative areas without adverse effects on breeding.	NO	The Scheme has been designed to avoid the majority of habitats used by key ecology receptors. Where this hasn't been possible the Scheme has embedded mitigation and enhancement, informed by extensive field surveys, to ensure that mitigation is fit for purpose.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	A substantial and detailed habitat management plan needs to be created as part of the DCO application to cover how the habitat is to be managed for the duration of the project and in the long-term after decommissioning, and specifications regarding area (in ha) and location to ensure mitigated/restored land is not created in isolation.	NO	Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES, will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works. The LEMP outlines the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Plans needed to be included for during and after the decommissioning phase. These need to be included to ensure the project's commitment to biodiversity net gain is achieved.	NO	The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain was presented in Chapter 8 of the PEI Report, published as part of the statutory consultation, alongside details of embedded mitigation measures. The DCO consent will require a DEMP to be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. It is proposed that ecological enhanced areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of this land and it may be returned to agricultural use. The Applicant will be required to abide by the DCO consent (which will secure the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan) and legislation relevant at the time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The proposal largely replaces the lost habitats with a single managed grassland habitat which will inevitably lead to a loss of the existing biodiversity.	NO	A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. By creating new and enhancing existing habitats, this will help to create a more complex ecosystem which in turn will improve the stability of the populations of species within the Site and those 'spilling in' from the surrounding areas. The types of habitat that are proposed to be created / enhanced throughout the Sunnica East and West Sites include: biodiverse grassland, marshy grassland, nesting plots for Stone Curlew, woodland and hedgerow planting. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. Other areas of habitat will be managed for overwintering and breeding birds. The Scheme design does include some habitats specifically for certain species. For example, as stated above, nesting plots suitable for Stone Curlew will be created in advance of the Stone Curlew breeding season. Additionally, seed-bearing species of plants will be planted within the grassland mixes in some areas to provide foraging habitat for the overwintering farmland birds. Biodiverse grassland to be created will be suitable for breeding farmland birds such as lapwing and skylark.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Once habitats are destroyed, they will not return.	NO	Habitats to be temporarily lost or damaged during construction would be fully reinstated on a like-for-like basis at the same location on completion of construction works, where practical. Some habitats would be restored and managed with the aim of increasing their biodiversity value in the long-term as set out within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Habitat connectivity between the development site and designated sites/priority habitats is very important.	NO	The Scheme will retain, e.g. hedgerows and enhance existing habitat corridors across the Scheme ensuring the ecological connectivity is maintained. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Concerned about destruction of habitat of rare animals.	NO	The Scheme design has embedded mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime (as assessed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]). Habitats to be temporarily lost or damaged during construction would be fully reinstated on a like-for-like basis at the same location on completion of construction works, where practical. Some habitats would be restored and managed with the aim of increasing their biodiversity value in the long-term as set out within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Who is funding the initial restoration/creation of the new habitats, but, more importantly, will the funding be available and adequate in order to maintain these sites, for the duration of the solar farms? How will this funding be protected?	NO	The construction, operation and maintenance of the scheme will be consented by way of a Development Consent Order (DCO). It will include requirements obliging the Applicant to implement appropriate mitigation measures for the impacts identified by the Applicant's environmental impact assessment activity, including those set out in the OLEMP. The owner of Sunnica Energy Farm will fund this mitigation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The consultation document proposes 89.5ha of habitat for Stone Curlews, comprising at least 3 x 2ha Stone Curlew nest plots, 10.7ha dry acid grassland, and the remainder (approx. 72.8ha) "biodiverse" grassland. Before we can comment properly on these proposals, we would need to see a fuller explanation of how the figure of 89.5ha was arrived at and the specific locations of these different habitats shown on a map. As presented, the RSPB is concerned that this does not adequately replace the Stone Curlew nesting and foraging habitat that would be lost. We also note that most of the proposed habitat is described as "biodiverse" grassland, suitable for Stone Curlew foraging, but unlikely to be suitable for nesting as the grass sward would be too long	YES	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design following the statutory consultation. A maximum of ten 2ha nesting/foraging plots for Stone Curlew will be created, along with approximately 108ha of land for foraging. The details are provided in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010106/APP/6.1] of the ES and Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We are concerned that Stone Curlews will not use the habitat replacement sites during the construction phase due to high levels of disturbance, and possibly during the operational phase too. The PEI Chapter 8 Ecology, section 8.9.14 states that the alternative breeding sites will be protected from noise and visual disturbance. More information is required to show how this will be achieved in order to guarantee successful breeding by an agreed population of Stone Curlews.	YES	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design following the statutory consultation. The phasing of the construction of the Scheme will be timed to avoid works and disturbance within 500m of Stone Curlew nesting locations and plots.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Using habitat information requirements of those species recorded in significant numbers from the project's bird surveys and those for which Cambridgeshire is important according to BTO breeding bird's data, the following broad habitat provisions should look to be provided: • Maintaining thick hedgerows with a mix in height (tall and short). • Restoration and/or creation of dry acid and wet grassland. • Grazing management to maintain varying sward heights/bare soil by poaching. • Shallow pools/wader scrapes. • Wild bird covers sown seed mix. • Tussocky grass/scrub/bramble field margins. • Open patches not surrounded by tall vegetation/trees/hedges.	NO	This is noted. A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. The types of habitat that are proposed to be created / enhanced throughout the Sunnica East and West Sites include: biodiverse grassland, marshy grassland, nesting plots for Stone Curlew, woodland and hedgerow planting. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. Other areas of habitat will be managed for overwintering and breeding birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The unique ecological attributes of the Brecks landscape within Sunnica East should be given special consideration. Agri-environment schemes in the Brecks favour cultivated margins over grass margins as many Brecks plants and invertebrates prefer bare or sparsely vegetated ground.	NO	This is noted. A variety of measures are embedded within the Scheme proposals to improve the existing habitat for species already present in the area. We are aiming to improve habitats to increase the range of species already present and to increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. This will help integrate the Scheme within the context of the existing landscape and prevent and reduce any adverse effects on the ecology of the site. A variety of habitats have been included within the Scheme design as embedded mitigation to further increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. The management of these habitats will help the Scheme to increase biodiversity within the Scheme, for example rotavating the soil may be used to create bare areas suitable for Brecks plants and invertebrates. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES) will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Providing alternative breeding sites is not necessarily the key to success as you have to get the birds to accept their new nesting environment and two years of major disruption is not conducive to acceptance.	NO	The Scheme has significant mitigation embedded in its design to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. Retained habitat will be positively managed to mitigate in the short-term the loss of other areas of habitat whilst mitigation areas develop. This will be embedded in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects on species prior to and during construction. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Furthermore, the DCO will require that the new habitat will need to be in place before construction can start on the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Habitat provision should be addressed across the whole of the project site, e.g., mitigated areas, including boundaries and headland buffers, and areas surrounding and under solar arrays where possible.	NO	The Scheme has significant mitigation embedded in its design to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. Land within the area reserved for solar development will additionally benefit from embedded mitigation to enhance opportunities for biodiversity, such as planting around and under the solar arrays.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Can hedges be grown to lessen the impact of the fencing?	NO	Yes, hedgerows will be grown which will mitigate the impact of the fencing. Proposed new native hedgerows would be between 0.6m and 0.8m in height when implemented and then managed and maintained between 2m and 3m in height. Assumptions for hedgerow planting are included in the ES under Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is difficult to interpret the portion of existing hedgerows and fully understand the areas of hedgerow mitigation that are to be introduced.	NO	The location of the new hedgerows are in the Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	I have concerns about existing hedgerows. I want assurance they will not be harmed as they provide essential homes to our native wildlife.	NO	The Scheme has ensured that existing woodland, treelines, and the hedgerows are retained and will be protected during construction of the Scheme wherever practicable. Some hedgerows will be removed in relation to the Cable Route and the provision of access. On completion of construction, the affected hedgerow sections in relation to the Cable Route will be re-planted and a diversity of native woody species of local provenance will be used to improve their biodiversity value.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Hedgerows along E19 and E22 should not be harmed.	NO	E19 to E22 are to the south of Elms Road, forming the southern part of the Sunnica East Site B and the intention is for these hedgerows to be retained overall with only localised potential loss to facilitate access into the Site.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There are already areas of the site which have been left to degrade and the Scheme should be looking to enhance and augment existing neglected hedgerows and shelterbelts.	NO	Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement have been embedded within the Scheme along with new hedgerow planting. Provisions within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) aim to diversify ecological value through the retention of the existing hedgerows and trees, to enhance these through restoration and creation of diverse habitats offering greater botanical and faunal interest to the Scheme, and to safeguard the habitats with potential for protected species.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is not clear where hedgerow losses will occur.	NO	The Scheme has ensured that existing woodland, treelines and the majority of hedgerows are retained and will be protected during construction of the Scheme. Hedgerow loss is predicted in relation to the access points into the scheme and along parts of the cable route, where hedgerows divide fields. On completion of construction, the affected hedgerow sections will be reinstated in full and a diversity of native woody species of local provenance will be used to improve their biodiversity value.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Turns countryside into brownfield land.	NO	We respectfully disagree with this assessment. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will need to be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. Given the DCO requirement to decommission the Scheme, the land would not be considered brownfield land. It is proposed that ecological enhanced areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of this land and it may be returned to agricultural use. The Applicant will be required to abide by the DCO consent (which will secure the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan) and legislation relevant at the time. The Framework DEMP is available in Appendix 16E of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Not much anywhere in East Site B for nature.	NO	A total of 67.1 ha within Sunnica East Site B will not be subject to development and has been set aside for creation of biodiverse habitats.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Much of the area proposed to be covered in solar panels forms a significant proportion of the northern end of Landscape Character Area 87 - East Anglian Chalk. The solar proposal in effect wrecks a large proportion of the open land characteristic of the East Anglia Chalk area. The Chalk area is a relatively narrow band from Letchworth to Newmarket and just beyond. Covering a large proportion of this with panels effectively erodes the northern end.	NO	Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES predicts that the Scheme is not anticipated to have a significant adverse effect on LCA 87: East Anglian Chalk. The Scheme has responded positively to the statements of environmental opportunity through new chalk grassland beneath all of the PV modules and whilst a change in land use, will be a very small part of the wider extent of LCA 87.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Landscaping should be appropriate to the local countryside and promote biodiversity e.g., use native species, introduce hedgerows.	NO	Landscaping will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. The Applicant is proposing to use native species where possible, as well as introducing new and enhancing existing hedgerows. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) sets out the Applicant's proposals.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Manage grassland in a way that benefits biodiversity e.g., wildflowers, mowing should be infrequent and later in the year.	NO	The intention is to manage grassland via grazing. This will be once the grassland has established sufficiently to tolerate grazing. The proposed management is set out in the Outline LEMP, submitted with the ES.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The types and location of grassland and other types of planting should be tailored to each location. The development site extends across a number of different landscape types and this should be reflected in the mitigation proposed.	NO	A variety of grassland types are proposed as set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES; and which take account of the local landscape setting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The applicant should consider sowing a meadow seed mix alongside proposed planting.	NO	A meadow seed mix is proposed alongside the planting. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) sets out our proposals for creating species-rich grassland and replacement arable fauna in the environs of the PV modules. We are proposing to sow a wildflower seed mix between the rows of PV modules following installation. Such appropriate mixes include EM3 – Special General Purpose Meadow Mixture or EM2 – Standard General Purpose Meadow Mixture. Beneath the PV modules, bare areas created during construction will be re-seeded using a mix of native grass and wildflowers.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The proposed screening will take too long to grow and replace habitats that have been removed.	NO	Proposed new native hedgerows would be between 0.6m and 0.8m in height when first planted. New and existing hedgerows within the order limits would be managed and maintained between 2m and 3m in height. This is assumed to be achieved within the early years of the Scheme. Retained habitats will have their quality improved, through positive management and embedded in the Scheme's Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (Appendix 10I) of the ES, which will mitigate in the short-term for the loss of other habitat areas whilst mitigation areas develop.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The land to west of Elevenways and the Green is currently used for intensive chicken production and horses and provides a home for Stone Curlews and other birds. It is not clear as to whether the current uses are to be removed under the Scheme and replaced with new seeded grassland?	YES	Mitigation areas within the order limits are required to offset potential impacts of the Scheme and promote biodiversity net gains and this land is proposed for grassland (Eco 3). This is in order to provide appropriate habitat provision for Stone Curlew to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. Our approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The grassland needs to be appropriately managed.	NO	Agreed. Management of grassland will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) sets out the Applicant's proposals.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What guarantees are there that the chalk grassland species will be managed appropriately?	NO	Appropriate management is key to the establishment and longevity of the grassland, which in turn is a large part of the mitigation. The management is therefore essential and will be subject to approval of the LEMP. The construction, operation and maintenance of the scheme will be consented by way of a Development Consent Order (DCO). It will include requirements obliging the Applicant to implement appropriate mitigation measures for the impacts identified by its environmental impact assessment activity, including those set out in the OLEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	A detailed management plan should be produced which looks at enhancing the environment of the full extent of Badlingham Lane and looks at replanting a tree line which has recently been removed	NO	Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping work. The Outline Plan will be developed in detail if the Scheme is approved and agreed with the host authorities. The Outline LEMP will outline the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational. Badlingham Lane is not within the DCO Order Limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is clear that in the past three years that the environment on and around Badlingham Lane has been allowed to deteriorate and it is questioned whether this is deliberate?	NO	The Applicant is not at this time in control of the land within the order limits and is therefore not responsible for the maintenance of land. The Applicant would assume ownership of the land within the order limits subject to obtaining Development Consent and subject to the agreement of the landowner. Badlingham Lane is not within the DCO Order Limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	A very detailed landscaping management plan needs to be secured to ensure that the landscaping is maintained and where necessary replaced during the lifetime of the project.	NO	Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES) will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping work. The LEMP will then be developed in detail if the Scheme is approved and agreed with the host authorities. The Outline LEMP outlines the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Grazing should only be undertaken during autumn and winter	NO	Management of grassland will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. Grazing will be undertaken once the new grassland has established to tolerate grazing and in accordance with welfare and farming practices as set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We are pleased to see prior thought into the mitigation measures needed to address general biodiversity loss (non-Stone Curlew impacts).	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Reference to 'undeveloped buffers/mitigation areas' are a welcome mitigation measure, but further detail is required to better understand how these will specifically benefit nature.	NO	Undeveloped buffers and mitigation areas have been embedded within the Scheme design to improve biodiversity. This allows the retention of existing woodland, treelines and the majority of hedgerows to be retained and protected, as well as existing grassland habitats. Mitigation areas are included within the Scheme design to successfully integrate the Scheme within the context of the existing landscape and prevent or reduce any adverse effects on ecological features. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES) details how these areas will be created and maintained throughout the Scheme's lifetime to deliver biodiversity enhancements.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	In support of the Wildlife Trust's research suggestions, the creation, approval and implementation of a long-term management strategy could see this project become a successful demonstration site in the potential and ability for future solar developments in their ability to provide for nature and biodiversity net gain. For example, with the site's array of hedgerows, there is the potential for the project to deliver optimal, long-term Turtle Dove habitat, which would be a great success for Cambridgeshire.	NO	This is noted. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, and the Environment Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out how this will be achieved (see Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation). Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES) outlines the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management, and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Who will be providing the environmental expertise? Are they recognised environmental groups with charitable status, or are they private companies who will be looking to profit from the venture?	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake environmental assessments on its behalf. AECOM is a private company that has carried out these assessments according to industry best practice. Where impacts have been identified, the Applicant is proposing mitigation. Further details of this are set out in the Framework OEMP provided within Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. During the operating life of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm, the operator would appoint contractors to manage the project sites on its behalf. Where possible, the Applicant aims to prioritise local suppliers within its supply chain and potential partnerships with charities will be considered. The DCO will, however, ultimately require compliance with the approved LEMPs, so the operators and contractors will be required to conform with them.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There is no indication that the land set aside for wildlife will be available prior to construction beginning.	NO	The Applicant would assume ownership of all of the land within the order limits subject to obtaining Development Consent and subject to the agreement of the landowner at the same time, and therefore it will be available prior to construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	How do animals react to EMFs or the noise generated by your equipment?	NO	Adverse impacts from EMFs are not expected as result of the Scheme. The Applicant has conducted a rigorous programme of environmental impact assessments prior to DCO submission. This includes assessments of the scheme's potential impacts on wildlife, where noise impacts are considered. The results of the Applicants assessments on the Scheme's impact on ecological receptors is included in chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The applicant should demonstrate that sufficient light will pass through the solar PV panel tables to support plant growth below.	NO	The Scheme information sets out the height of the PV modules off of the ground and the distance between the rows of PV modules, which is adequate for the provision of light to enable plant growth.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Too close to an SSSI, Chippenham Fen, site of the very rare Cambridge Milk Parsley and only one of three sites for the Early Marsh Orchid.	NO	The Applicant is aware that there are a number of sites close to the Scheme that are designated for their ecological significance, including Chippenham Fen. Cambridge Milk Parsley and Early Marsh Orchid have been identified and assessed in the Flora Survey Report, which has been published in Appendix 8C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Chippenham Fen could be affected during construction activities due to dust deposition and increased air pollution during construction activities. This effect can lead to habitat degradation and changes to communities' structure and function by affecting key species. Standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP, and these measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention. A Framework CEMP is provided within Appendix 16C [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Consequently, indirect effects to designated sites during construction will not occur and there will be no effect to the integrity of Chippenham Fen.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The management of areas for rare and scarce arable plants is welcomed and it is noted that this will be concentrated in areas already identified for arable plants. However, impact avoidance (for example through limiting soil profiling and compaction) in these areas should also be implemented.	NO	Compliance with planning policy requires that the proposed development considers and engages the following mitigation hierarchy where there is potential for impacts on relevant ecological receptors: 1. Avoid features where possible 2. Minimise impact by design, method of working or other measures (mitigation) e.g. by enhancing existing features; and 3. Compensate for significant residual impacts, e.g. by providing suitable habitats elsewhere (whether in the control of the Applicant or otherwise legally enforceable through planning condition or Section 106 agreement). The Applicant has adhered to the mitigation hierarchy in development of its proposals. Management will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. This is secured through Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES. All soil handling will be subject to a Soil Management Plan that will form part of the development Construction Management Plan. A Framework CEMP is included in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Use native UK species for screening and hedging.	NO	Native UK hedgerow planting has been incorporated throughout the Scheme. Species will include Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>), Blackthorn (<i>Prunus spinosa</i>), Hazel (<i>Corylus avellana</i>), Holly (<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>) and Field Maple (<i>Acer campestre</i>). This is outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Please double the provisions you have already proposed for planting new vegetation	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Further landscaping has been introduced as part of the revised Scheme design following the statutory consultation. This has increased planting at parcels E12, W10, W11, and W15. These changes and the incorporation of larger setbacks from the Scheme boundary mean that the total area provided for ecological mitigation has increased.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	No commitment is made to researching the impacts of the solar farm on wildlife, should it be approved, despite this being an under-researched area and these proposals covering such a large area of habitat.	NO	Monitoring will be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] are being achieved. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the DCO submission and included within the finalised LEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Wildlife will be harmed if they get too close to the panels due to toxic chemicals	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees that wildlife will be harmed by the PV modules during their operation. As per Chapter 3, Scheme Description within the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1], the batteries will be housed in containers. This will ensure that any leakages will be contained and not result in contamination of the ground and groundwater. A fully functional PV module is not toxic and does not present a danger to its surrounding environs. The Applicant does however recognise the potential for PV modules to be damaged and to leak. For this reason, the OEMP will include a regime of regular checks to identify and fix any damage prior to their being any leaks from the PV modules. The Plan will also set out precautions to be followed during maintenance activities to minimise the risk of any leaks. Security fencing will be established at an early stage during construction to protect retained habitats during construction. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the Sunnica Energy Farm. Further information on this is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The ecological impacts resulting from the site have been assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and the results show that wildlife will not be harmed by toxic chemicals from proximity of the PV modules. Further details on this can be found within Chapter 8 - Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Sheep should graze around the panels.	NO	It is possible to use land within a solar farm for different purposes, including grazing, during the project's operational lifetime. It is likely that the vegetation will be maintained through a mixture of mowing and grazing. Further information can be found in Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP and Appendix 16F: Framework OEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Can animals safely graze underneath the panels without damaging them or chewing through wiring?	NO	Sheep can graze safely within a solar farm and have been used within other solar farm projects to maintain vegetation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Your brochure illustrate sheep cropping the undergrowth. Is this just marketing?		No, it is intended for sheep to graze, once the new grassland has established sufficiently.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Sheep grazing below the panels is a decadent waste of good farmland.	NO	A fallow period and removal of agriculture will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Based on the assessments, the majority of land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We strongly recommend that the panels should be erected to allow a commitment to sheep grazing, as this management regime is likely to deliver the best biodiversity outcomes for grassland habitats.	NO	It is possible to use land within a solar farm for different purposes, including grazing, during the project's operational lifetime. It is likely that the vegetation will be maintained through a mixture of mowing and grazing. Further information can be found in Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP and Appendix 16F: Framework OEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Sheep cannot graze around the solar panels.	NO	Sheep are able to graze safely within a solar farm and have been used within other solar farm projects to maintain vegetation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Sunnica claim that the layers of soil will be carefully removed and then reinstated in the same order as it came out. In reality it is impossible to do this.	NO	Agricultural soils will be managed, preserved, retained and reinstated in accordance with Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) guidance. Key mitigation measures from this guidance are included in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What impact will the solar arrays have on the land underneath – will it change soil temperatures and consequently microbes, insects and dependant animals?	NO	The Agricultural Good Practice Guidance for Solar Farms notes that pasture productivity below solar farms is similar to the same land without PV modules. For the duration of the Scheme, the site will convert from arable land to pasture with no cultivation. This will enable a recovery of soil organic matter depleted by cultivation. Soil fauna and microorganism communities are dynamic and highly complex, but an extended fallow period can be expected to provide clear biodiversity and soil health benefits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The topsoil will be compacted and unsuitable for use due to traffic.	NO	At present the land is in arable use with annual cultivation and trafficking by heavy vehicles such as harvesters and grain trailers. Construction and decommissioning traffic will not exceed the compaction from business as usual. The extended fallow period will allow the roots of the perennial cover to remediate any deep compaction that is a common problem for arable land with light textured soil.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	No usable information has been supplied on the effect that the proposal will have on the local microclimate and soil structure. This is important due to the extremely free draining and sandy nature of the locality. A concern is noted about possible dust during construction, and this has not been sufficiently answered. I have read that sandstorms were apparently an issue here in past centuries, and when the weather is dry, soil blows in our windows. Hotter, drier summers could potentially cause further problems that the development has not been shown to combat.	NO	Soil erosion by wind or water requires bare soil surfaces, such as cultivated fields and seed beds. For the duration of the Scheme the solar farm will have a permanent green cover without annual periods of bare soil, this will prevent loss of soil by erosion, reducing the nuisance caused by wind blown sediment to local residents. No significant dust impacts are predicted to arise from the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	During the installation of the cables through the Open Cut trenching system, concern is raised over the amount of topsoil and subsoil that has to be removed in order to accommodate these cables. Topsoil cannot be stored above 2 meters high for lengthy periods of time before anaerobic conditions set in and destroy the value of the topsoil.	NO	Cable trenches will only need to be open for a short period, with the topsoil and subsoil placed at the sides of the trench rather than removed and stored. As the topsoil will be placed alongside the trench excavation, the height of the pile will be similar to the depth of the topsoil excavated, about 30cm. It will be returned to recover the trench long before anaerobic conditions could develop. All soil handling will be subject to a Soil Management Plan that will form part of the development Construction Management Plan. A Framework CEMP is included in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The piling activity for panel supports and the assembly of panels will affect Breckland Soil and expose it to significant wind erosion during the 2-year construction period then a further year until native grassland and ecology can get established.	NO	A pasture crop will be established before construction work starts. The permanent green cover will eliminate the periods of bare soil, following cultivation and sowing, that are the source of wind and water eroded sediment. All soil handling will be subject to a Soil Management Plan that will form part of the development Construction Management Plan. A Framework CEMP is included in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Heavy metals will build in the surrounding soil.	NO	Best practice avoidance and mitigation measures for ground contamination are outlined in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES). It is not predicted that there will any adverse effects to soil arising from the operation of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The site after it is decommissioned will be of poor quality, with reduced fertility and increased weed burden.	NO	No significant residual effects on ecological features are predicted during decommissioning of the Scheme. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a DEMP will be prepared prior to decommissioning works commencing to outline how this will be achieved. Additionally, by increasing the area of long-term planting throughout the Site and giving the land a 'break' from the regular cycle of growth and harvesting, there is a likelihood that nutrients within the soils, including nitrogen compounds, will recover naturally over time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Healthy soil will be taken away and would not recover for several years after the panels are removed.	NO	Soil will not be removed from the site. Soil movement within the site will only occur over a limited extent such as areas of access tracks and switchgear housings. Agricultural soils will be managed, preserved, retained and reinstated in accordance with Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) guidance. Key mitigation measures from this guidance are included in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	If the plant goes on land when it is wet, the damage to soil structure will take years to recover.	NO	A Soil Management Plan will form part of the site Construction Environmental Management Plan and will be produced prior to construction. It will include guidance on assessing the plastic limit of soil with work suspended following rainfall until soil moisture content has fallen below the plastic limit.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There is a lack of clarity around the width of the proposed tree belts, and it is unclear whether they are 5m, 15m or 30m.	NO	The widths of the tree belts varies to reflect local conditions and character, but in general they are 10m in width. The Landscape Plans in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) provide additional specific measurements which will be developed further for the detailed LEMPs to be approved by local authorities at detailed design stage.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The beech trees lining both sides of the road between Snailwell and Chippenham should not be disturbed due to underground cable laying	NO	These trees have been identified as part of the High-Level Tree Constraints Report (ES, Appendix 10B [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and will be retained and protected during the cable laying.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Trees need to be the right species to tolerate summer drought and winter waterlogging and must be properly planted and maintained during the establishment phase.	NO	Noted and agreed. The proposed trees and management (which will take account of seasonal concerns) is set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Trees and shrubs will be cut down if in the way of cabling and this needs to be stopped.	NO	The Scheme has ensured that existing woodland, treelines, and the majority of hedgerows are retained and will be protected during construction of the Scheme overall, such that any loss of vegetation is minimised. The Applicant has conducted a High-Level Tree Constraints Report (ES, Appendix 10B) which sets out constraints posed by existing trees within the Scheme to enable the choice of the cable route to minimise impacts. On completion of construction, any loss to hedgerow or trees will be reinstated. This is outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Do the proposals provide planting out the entrance to Brook Land opposite Wildtracks entrance?	NO	Yes, tree planting and/or hedgerow infilling is planned in the land opposite the Wildtracks site in combination with retaining the roadside hedgerow. The planting is planned to be undertaken from the north west corner of the field, along the field boundary and the B1085, and end at the field entrance opposite the Wildtracks entrance.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	As the proposal site is immediately adjacent to the village, the wildlife using the gardens and green spaces of the village should also have been given weight because it will have a relationship to the wider landscape.	NO	The spatial scope of assessments undertaken have been justified by the Applicant. The study areas are a function of the nature of the impacts and the locations of potentially affected environmental resources or receptors. All designated sites, sensitive habitats, and species of importance that occur within the ecological Zone of Influence (Zol) of the Scheme were considered when undertaking ecological assessments, the extent of Zol varies according to the ecological receptor in question and with regard to the precautionary principle to ensure sufficient data were gathered to meet any design iterations which may change the likely Zol used to undertake the impact assessment. The ecological Zone of Influence is set out in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement: Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What measures are going to be taken to ensure that species can move freely across the landscape?	NO	The Scheme will retain hedgerows and enhance existing habitat corridors across the Scheme ensuring the ecological connectivity is maintained. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and will not be trapped within the scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The impact on wildlife is unknown and potentially harmful.	NO	The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on wildlife as part of the Scheme's EIA and no significant effects are identified. The Applicant is committed to achieving biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving this is presented in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010106/APP/6.7]. Monitoring will be carried out throughout the Scheme's operational lifetime to ensure the Applicant's ecological obligations are being met. The embedded mitigation in the Scheme includes areas of habitat creation and enhancement throughout the Order limits to provide benefit to the local wildlife. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation to increase land available for ecological mitigation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Boundaries to the farm should allow wildlife access to minimise disruption to their walkways.	NO	Security fencing will be established at an early stage during construction to protect retained habitats during construction. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and will not be trapped within the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We currently enjoy sights of roe deer in the area.	NO	The Scheme's potential impact on wildlife has been assessed and is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The assessment concludes no significant effects on habitats or wildlife, including deer.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	How will the Scheme affect our populations of Great Crested Newts	YES	No Great Crested Newts were recorded within any of the waterbodies or watercourses surveyed within the Order limits during the Great Crested Newt surveys, as such no effects are predicted. A Great Crested Newt Survey Report is included in Appendix 8F of the Environmental Statement.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	This is home to deer, foxes, squirrels, rabbits, hares and badgers, amongst others, which can currently roam our fields.	NO	The Applicant has conducted habitat and species surveys to identify potential impacts on wildlife from development. It is noted that all the species included in the response are present within the Order limits and the Applicant has assessed the value of the Scheme for biodiversity. The methodology for this assessment and the conclusions drawn are presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The assessment concludes no significant effects on habitats or wildlife, including the species mentioned in the response.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We are currently privileged to reside in an area where especially hares roam over large areas - this part of the country has one of the highest populations and this will be threatened.	NO	It has been concluded that brown hares are present within the Order limits. The Applicants assessment of the hare population is included within Appendix 8B: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Assessment of brown hare has helped form the development of the Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C [EN919196/APP/6.2]. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the scheme. Measures to prevent or reduce hare grazing may be required initially to allow rich grassland to establish properly, but this is not currently proposed for sown areas. This situation will be monitored to determine if management action is required.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We are concerned about the impact on badgers.	NO	The presence of badgers was identified within the Order limits. Mitigation, avoidance and enhancement measures are included within the Scheme design to ensure that the long-term integrity of identified badger setts is maintained. These measures will maintain habitat connectivity between the setts and the wider landscape out of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	If the Lee Brook is fenced in otters and egrets will go.	NO	The Lee Brook will not be fenced in. There are no significant impacts anticipated on otters as a result of the Scheme. The construction of the Scheme will avoid watercourses where otters were recorded, and these will be retained and enhanced where possible. There will be no loss of habitat used by otters anywhere in the Order limits. Little Egret were assessed as part of the Wintering Bird Survey Report, which is included in Appendix 8H of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. There are no significant impacts anticipated on egrets as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There are varied and rare species of fish and wildlife along the river Lea.	NO	There are no significant effects anticipated to watercourses as a result of the Scheme. All watercourse within the Order limits will be retained and measures embedded within the Scheme design to protect retained habitats during construction. A Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] will be submitted as part of the DCO application which will adopt standard environmental protection measures during construction, such as dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, pollution during construction will not affect water quality and therefore, fish.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The work of digging trenches will adversely affect wildlife.	NO	Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects on species prior to and during construction. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will prevent trapping wildlife in construction excavations in order to ensure compliance with animal welfare legislation. All excavations deeper than 1m would be covered or fenced overnight, or where this is not practicable, a means of escape would be fitted (e.g., battened soil slope or scaffold plank) to provide an escape route should any animals stray into the construction site and fall into an excavation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	All of the works will kill off the wildlife forever.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The Applicant has included precautionary working methods and embedded mitigation measures within the CEMP to offset potential impacts on biodiversity during construction of the Scheme. This includes avoidance of construction traffic through designated sites and guidance on vegetation clearance. A pre-construction site walkover will be undertaken in advance of works to re-confirm ecological baseline conditions, as well as completing updated species surveys for wildlife identified within the Scheme. This will be secured by a requirement of the draft DCO. Ongoing monitoring will be overseen by a licensed Ecological Clerk of Works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Simply the mere presence of this construction on their doorstep will cause disturbance to wildlife or may cause their food supply to disappear.	NO	Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects on species prior to and during construction. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has included precautionary working methods and embedded mitigation measures within the CEMP to offset potential impacts on biodiversity during construction of the Scheme. This includes avoidance of construction traffic through designated sites and guidance on vegetation clearance. A pre-construction site walkover will be undertaken in advance of works to re-confirm ecological baseline conditions, as well as completing updated species surveys for wildlife identified within the Scheme. This will be secured by a requirement of the draft DCO. Ongoing monitoring will be overseen by a licensed Ecological Clerk of Works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Which species will be translocated?	NO	There are no proposals to translocate any species. Sufficient habitat will be retained or created on site for the existing biodiversity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Who will oversee the process of translocating species and be on site to ensure all is done correctly?	NO	There are no proposals to translocate any species. Sufficient habitat will be retained or created on site for the existing biodiversity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Where will the species be translocated to?	NO	There are no proposals to translocate any species. Sufficient habitat will be retained or created on site for the existing biodiversity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Will the translocation of species be permanent or temporary?	NO	There are no proposals to translocate any species. Sufficient habitat will be retained or created on site for the existing biodiversity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Wildlife cannot be simply asked to relocate to a place of your convenience to accommodate your monstrous structures.	NO	There are no proposals to translocate any species. Sufficient habitat will be retained or created on site for the existing biodiversity.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Tractor mowing will decimate wildlife.	NO	It is likely that the vegetation will be maintained through a mixture of mowing and grazing. Where mowing is used, it will be undertaken in appropriate conditions so to avoid impact on resident ecology. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is absolute nonsense to say wildlife will not be affected.	NO	It is predicted that the Scheme design has embedded significant mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime. The Applicant is committed to achieving net biodiversity gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving this is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Monitoring will be carried out throughout the Scheme's operational lifetime to ensure the Applicant's ecological obligations are being met. A variety of measures are embedded within the Scheme proposals to improve the existing habitat for species already present in the area. We are aiming to improve habitats to increase the range of species already present and to increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. This will help integrate the Scheme within the context of the existing landscape and prevent and reduce any adverse effects on the ecology of the site. A variety of habitats have been included within the Scheme design as embedded mitigation to further increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Lee Brook itself is relatively clean and important invertebrates have been recorded including Golden Ringed Dragonfly Nymphs, Alderfly and Ramshorn Snail, this Brook is at risk from sediment and physical disturbance along its length under the current proposals.	NO	The Scheme will avoid the Lee Brook and 10m offsets are included within the Scheme design to provide a buffer during construction and operation. Disturbance, including sediment runoff during construction will be managed through the CEMP. A Framework CEMP is provided within Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	How can you be 100% sure that protected species will be protected? Surely all the upheaval and pollution will chase them away from their natural habitat.	NO	It is predicted that the Scheme design has embedded significant mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime. The Applicant will be required to ensure compliance with all relevant legislation relating to protected species. is committed to achieving net biodiversity gain. Monitoring will be carried out throughout the Scheme's operational lifetime to ensure the Applicant's ecological obligations are being met. A variety of measures are embedded within the Scheme proposals to improve the existing habitat for species already present in the area. We are aiming to improve habitats to increase the range of species already present and to increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. This will help integrate the Scheme within the context of the existing landscape and prevent and reduce any adverse effects on the ecology of the site. A variety of habitats have been included within the Scheme design as embedded mitigation to further increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Sunnica has conceded that there will be a loss of wildlife species as a result of their huge proposal.	NO	It is predicted that the Scheme design has embedded significant mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects to important ecological features. No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime. The Applicant is committed to achieving net biodiversity gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving this is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Monitoring will be carried out throughout the Scheme's operational lifetime to ensure the Applicant's ecological obligations are being met. The embedded mitigation in the Scheme includes areas of habitat creation and enhancement throughout the order limits to provide benefit to the local wildlife. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the statutory consultation to increase land available for ecological mitigation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Please encourage wildlife back after construction has ended.	NO	The Applicant is committed to achieving net biodiversity gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving this is presented in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Monitoring will be carried out throughout the Scheme's operational lifetime to ensure the Applicant's ecological obligations are being met. A variety of measures are embedded within the Scheme proposals to improve the existing habitat for species already present in the area. We are aiming to improve habitats to increase the range of species already present and to increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. This will help integrate the Scheme within the context of the existing landscape and prevent and reduce any adverse effects on the ecology of the site. A variety of habitats have been included within the Scheme design as embedded mitigation to further increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Currently on the fields behind the Freckenham Road we have pigs and horse which enable a huge range of insect and micro biological life to thrive, helping birds and other flora and fauna- all that will go.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory Consultation. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide habitats for biodiversity. These revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for biodiversity to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. This is enshrined through measures outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). A Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010106/APP/6.7] has been produced. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. An approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units has been calculated as a result of the Scheme. 292ha of the Order limits will be set aside for habitat creation through native grassland, wetland, tree and hedgerow planting. Native grassland will be planted between PV module strings and throughout the developable area in addition to these areas set aside for habitat creation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	How will wildlife be able to migrate the sites if they are fenced in?	NO	Security fencing will be established at an early stage during construction to protect retained habitats during construction. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the scheme. This is enshrined through measures outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). Measures to prevent or reduce rabbit and hare grazing may be required initially to allow rich grassland to establish properly, but this is not currently proposed for sown areas. This situation will be monitored to determine if management action is required.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	You will isolate and cut through wildlife routes between Chippenham Fen and Snailwell SSSI.	NO	The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the scheme. No adverse effects are predicted to species that utilise Chippenham Fen and Snailwell SSSI.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Scheme will destroy animal crossing routes.	NO	Security fencing will be established at an early stage during construction to protect retained habitats during construction. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the scheme. This is enshrined through measures outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). Measures to prevent or reduce rabbit and hare grazing may be required initially to allow rich grassland to establish properly, but this is not currently proposed for sown areas. This situation will be monitored to determine if management action is required.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Fencing will push wildlife onto the roads and cause accidents.	NO	Security fencing will be established at an early stage during construction to protect retained habitats during construction. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height. The erection of fencing will be undertaken to ensure that existing connectivity for wildlife will be maintained and species will be able to move through the site onto neighbouring farmland and not be trapped within the scheme, as set out in the Framework CEMP. Measures to prevent or reduce rabbit and hare grazing may be required initially to allow rich grassland to establish properly, but this is not currently proposed for sown areas. This situation will be monitored to determine if management action is required.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Construction and traffic movements will kill off most of the wildlife.	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application (Appendix 16C). The Applicant has included precautionary working methods and embedded mitigation measures within the CEMP to offset potential impacts on biodiversity during construction of the Scheme. This includes avoidance of construction traffic through designated sites and guidance on vegetation clearance. A pre-construction site walkover will be undertaken in advance of works to re-confirm ecological baseline conditions, as well as completing updated species surveys for wildlife identified within the Scheme. This will be secured by a requirement of the draft DCO. Ongoing monitoring will be overseen by a licensed Ecological Clerk of Works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	West Site B is closest and requires the most biodiversity management and should be taken out of the Scheme.	NO	The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. Sunnica West Site B has been amended to create additional linkages between the wetlands established at Sunnica West Site B. The Applicant considers that it has incorporated appropriate mitigation within Sunnica West Site B and as such it does not negatively impact on biodiversity. Further information on the project design is provided in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The woodland planting should be a mix of coniferous and deciduous species.	NO	It is proposed that trees within the order limits will be from suitable native species and include deciduous and coniferous species, as set out in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This Plan will be secured through the DCO which includes provision for the successful establishment and future management of biodiversity and landscaping works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The preliminary EIA made no attempt to count the local hare population, in the area round the U6006 that appears to be thriving, and more effort should therefore be made in this regard.	NO	The Applicant included its assessments of the hare population within the Scheme boundary within the PEI Report, and is also provided within Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Assessment of brown hare has helped form the development of Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN919196/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Given that construction involves the destruction of acid grassland and the planting of new, the removal of topsoil, flattening of the landscape, the driving of piles 3.5m into the ground and the installation of roadways and security fencing, the idea that the effect is minor and the wildlife will simply recolonise seems highly questionable.	NO	The Applicant considers the Scheme has been designed to take into account the potential impact on ecology and has provided significant embedded mitigation. Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]), outlines the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. In addition, standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP. A Framework CEMP has been submitted as part of the ES at Appendix 16C [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The full assessment on the potential impacts upon The Brecks has not been provided, and more focus on conserving and enhancing Breckland habitats is needed.	NO	The Applicant is aware that there are a number of sites close to the Scheme that are designated for their ecological significance, including the Breckland Special Protection Area. The Applicant has undertaken extensive assessments to assess the potential environmental and visual impacts of the Scheme on the Breckland landscape area. The Breckland SPA is approximately 1.4km to the north-east of the Sunnica East Site B. Construction activities are unlikely to affect the site directly given distance between the Scheme boundary and the designated site. The Scheme will aim will be to create a net improvement in biodiversity through mitigation measures. Appendix 10I: Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]), details how this will be achieved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The report states the construction of the site will not directly impact on habitat within the Chippenham Fen and Snailwell Poor's Fen designated sites. But that is very different from saying that the wildlife at Chippenham Fen will be unaffected.	NO	The Applicant has undertaken extensive assessments on the potential ecological impacts on Chippenham and Snailwell Poor's Fen designated sites. The findings are included within Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/AP/6.1] and no significant effects have been identified to wildlife from the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The radius used to assess for the scheme's impact on SSSIs is not sufficient. It is usual to look at SSSIs within 5 km of a development rather than 2km.	NO	The identification of SSSIs has been based upon a likely 'zone of influence' over which impacts from the Scheme may arise. These zones of influences have been agreed with stakeholders and have been determined the SSSIs considered in the assessment. These are described in Chapter 8 Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is not clear whether the necessary access to all areas for survey work and assessment was given (and therefore whether the fieldwork expected as part of such an assessment has been undertaken).	NO	The PEI Report represents a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application, including undertaking the necessary surveys to inform them. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	I've tried to look at PEI (Preliminary Environmental Information) Report Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation. In essence, there is a table where all species are listed. Then they are listed again with a column 'Taken forward for detailed Assessment?' In this way, many species receive a No, so the assessment list is reduced. In the next table, Table 8-11: Summary of Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect, then those taken forward are given Effect Categories, notably Minor Adverse or Negligible. There is no species that have any other category, hence the conclusion no adverse environmental effect. This makes me think the report was constructed in such a way to come to the conclusion that Sunnica would want it to be.	NO	The Applicant has appointed AECOM to undertake an EIA on its behalf. Although AECOM is employed by the Applicant for this purpose, the findings are impartial and based upon industry best practice. The impact assessment, was undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance for Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA), issued by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) entitled 'Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. It is not necessary in the assessment to address all habitats and species with potential to occur in the relevant study area and instead the focus is on those that are "relevant" i.e. ecological features that are considered to be important and have the ability to be potentially affected by the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Species and species groups have not been individually assessed.	NO	A wide range of species and species groups have been assessed within Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Individual survey reports for the following surveys have been provided as appendices: a. Appendix 8A – Relevant legislation and policy; b. Appendix 8B – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report; c. Appendix 8C – Terrestrial habitats and flora report; d. Appendix 8D – Terrestrial Invertebrate survey report; e. Appendix 8E – Aquatic Ecology report; f. Appendix 8F – Great Crested Newt survey report; g. Appendix 8G – Report on surveys for reptiles; h. Appendix 8H – Wintering bird survey report; i. Appendix 8I – Report on surveys for breeding birds; j. Appendix 8J – Report on surveys for bats; k. Appendix 8K – Badger survey report; l. Appendix 8L – Report on surveys for riparian mammals; and m. Appendix 8M – Habitats Regulations Assessment: Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Habitat loss and disturbance to Stone Curlew has not been adequately discussed.	NO	The potential impact on Stone Curlew was assessed as part of the ecology assessment presented in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], Appendix 8I Breeding Bird Survey Report [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Appendix 8M Habitats Regulations Assessment: Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. An offsetting habitat provision for Stone Curlews specification has also been submitted with the DCO Application [EN010106/APP/6.6]. Revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Words such as 'improved' carry no meaning without an assessment of the current interest and what the projected interest will be in quantitative terms. Improvement will not necessarily mitigate for loss even at long timescales. This term is repeated throughout Chapter 8, is used as a basis to conclude temporary negligible effect and needs to be reviewed.	NO	A Biodiversity Net Gain assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7] has been undertaken and an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units has been calculated as a result of the Scheme. 292ha of the Order limits will be set aside for habitat creation through native grassland, wetland, tree and hedgerow planting. Native grassland will be planted between PV module strings and throughout the developable area in addition to these areas set aside for habitat creation. The Applicant has undertaken extensive assessments and surveys to inform the Scheme design and mitigation proposals. These have been submitted as appendices to the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	No evidence has been provided to substantiate the assertion that the scheme will deliver 'significant enhancements of biodiversity'.	NO	The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, and the Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010106/APP/6.7] sets out how this will be achieved. An approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units is anticipated as a result of the Scheme. Monitoring will also be implemented to determine that the objectives documented within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] are achieved during operation. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised and agreed as part of the DCO submission and included within the finalised LEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Ecological interactions should not have been scoped out, particularly given that there is uncertainty that there are negligible effects on the biodiversity receptors. Possible interactions exist between other matters such as landscape, noise and dust.	NO	The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes the Applicant's assessment of effect interactions, see Chapter 17: Effect Interactions. The assessment concludes no significant effects on ecological receptors as a result of effect interactions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The conclusion of Wards Associate that the ecological assessment is inadequate could give rise to the identification of significant adverse effects on important ecological features. In the absence of this further work, the conclusions that have been reached are not sufficiently justified or evidenced, are unreliable and are not fit for purpose.	NO	The PEI Report was published at statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. The Ecology chapter (Chapter 8) has been developed since statutory consultation and is provided in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] where conclusions are fully evidenced and justified.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is not appropriate to rule out areas for faunal survey, particularly reptile survey, on the basis of distant assessment of habitat.	NO	All wildlife and habitat surveys met appropriate guidelines and guidance and details were published as part of Chapter 8 of the PEI Report, and are now provided within Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The study area was selected to ensure the assessment is proportionate, in accordance with the requirements of the NPS and the NPPF.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Clarification should be given regarding the use of standard guidance for very large areas of land, for example the use of only 8 static bats detectors across all four areas and cable routes, and why this is sufficient. The figures showing the results of the transect surveys suggest that potentially suitable areas were omitted.	NO	The Applicant has continued to undertake ecological surveys and assessments throughout the EIA process. The Applicant has detailed its assumptions and rationale in undertaking its Bat Survey Report through a dedicated methodology section. The report is considered sufficient for assessing bat numbers within the Scheme boundary. The updated report is provided in Appendix 8J of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is expected that full details of bird surveys with no redactions will be made available to bona fide reviewers of the full EIA.	NO	The breeding survey bird report presented in Appendix 8I of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] was redacted from public access to remove the breeding locations of protected bird species. It will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate as part of the DCO application, but it is likely that it will be uploaded by them to their website with similar redactions.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is not possible to say that a successful breeding site of Stone Curlew will remain within the DCO area.	NO	We have conducted surveys to identify Stone Curlew nesting sites. This has informed the design of the Scheme. Taking into account the results of these surveys, parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for Stone Curlew territories. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide further habitat for Stone Curlew. These revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The size of the Stone Curlew population and the proportion present on site has been inadequately flagged in considering the scale of any impact.	NO	We have conducted surveys to identify Stone Curlew nesting sites and considered the results of recent surveys carried out by others. This has informed the design of the Scheme. Taking into account the results of these surveys, parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for Stone Curlew. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide further habitat for Stone Curlew. These revisions to the Scheme design have resulted in the creation of a large contiguous area for Stone Curlews to the south of Freckenham Road and Worlington. The Applicant's approach to supporting the Stone Curlew population in the area has been informed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Can we request that an Effect Nature Report will be made available to The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire, Suffolk Wildlife Trust; Suffolk County Council; Cambridge County Council; West Suffolk Council; Natural England; East Cambridgeshire District Council; and Royal Society for Protection of Birds (RSPB) in order to review the impact assessment of the Sunnica Scheme.	NO	The Applicant has sought consultation on the Scheme from the listed groups. It is unclear what an Effect Nature Report is, however, the Applicant welcomes ongoing engagement with environmental stakeholders. Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the potential impacts of the Scheme on biodiversity and has been submitted with the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There is no consideration given to the long-term loss of significant areas of land. Irrespective of any mitigation or compensation, that land will not be available to, for example, wintering Skylark, a S41 species. The distribution of Species of Conservation Concern Fig 8C-3 shows the widespread distribution of such species.	NO	Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the operational life of the Scheme and potential impacts on biodiversity and concludes that no significant effects will arise. Impact avoidance and embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, including land managed for as biodiverse grassland which is suitable for Skylark. This was included in Chapter 8 of the PEI Report, and Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES details how this will be achieved.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Although there is an evaluation of survey data and a level of importance ascribed, in a number of cases, this is qualified by described as 'only' or 'no more than'. This is misleading when applied to County or District levels of value.	NO	Where the terms 'only' or 'no more than' are used it is because specific quantitative data to support ascribing a geographical value is not available and professional judgement has been used to assess a population as not likely to meet a particular threshold.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What surveys have been done with regard to native species in woodland, hedgerows etc that exist the impact that 3 years of construction will have on them/ breeding/ potential loss of habitat	NO	The Applicant has undertaken a Breeding Bird Survey Report. This is included under Appendix 8I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Chapter 8 of the ES has concluded that there will be no significant impacts to any species.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	It is appreciated that this is a preliminary assessment of the impacts of the proposed development. Nevertheless, the full range of potential impacts have not been considered. It should be expected that a full, comprehensive evaluation of the potential impacts is considered, backed up by and referenced by the appropriate science. This is not the case.	NO	The PEI Report was published prior to the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Therefore, it was not possible to provide some detail requested by community consultees in the PEI Report. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. The Applicant made the assessments and surveys used to inform the Scheme design available as part of its statutory consultation. These were included as the Appendices to the PEI Report. Updated assessments are now provided as appendices to the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] that has been submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	All terrestrial invertebrates are treated as one group despite widely differing requirements and unquantified and undescribed 'biodiverse' improvements proposed, apparently limited to grassland which may or may not deliver net benefit on an undiscussed scale.	NO	All findings are based upon industry best practice. Discussion of terrestrial invertebrate species that can be found within the Scheme boundary in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which is included as Appendix 8B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We are concerned that Ecology and Nature Conservation (Chapter 8) of the PEIR does not pull through much of the critical detail from the ecological surveys into the ecological impact assessment.	NO	The Applicant has used the surveys conducted to inform the design of Sunnica Energy Farm and the assessment carried out in both the PEI Report and the ES. This has ensured the Scheme will not cause any significant effects to ecology and informed the Scheme's significant embedded mitigation that will deliver a biodiversity net gain. A Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010106/APP/6.7] has been produced and the principle will be enshrined through the measures in the LEMP which will be secured through the DCO (submitted as part of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Framework Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) are lacking in required detail.	NO	The PEI Report was published prior to the start of the statutory consultation and included details of a number of aspects of the Scheme. The PEI Report was a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application. All of the Applicant's application documents including the Framework CEMP and Outline LEMP will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, following which, members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by way of relevant representations and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the application to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Appendix 8C: Terrestrial Invertebrate Scoping Report provides a list of sites providing further surveys. We query whether these surveys have been undertaken as there is no reference to any update in the PEIR Chapter 8.	NO	The Applicant has continued to undertake ecological surveys and assessments throughout the statutory consultation process. Appendix 8C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] detail the results of these surveys.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	What historical data do you have to support there will be net gain in habitats and the overall impact will be beneficial? This has come up time and time again throughout your report but there are no case studies to support Sunnica's predictions.		The Applicant has commissioned extensive baseline surveys of the existing biodiversity present. These surveys are presented in Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN0101006/APP/6.1] and provide the basis of the assessment and have informed appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. This is enshrined through measures presented in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES and reported on in the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7]. The Scheme's embedded mitigation will (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area..

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Appendix 8G: Bat Survey Report indicates that the site is up to county importance for foraging and commuting bats, however, there is currently insufficient evidence within the CEMP to ensure that bats would not be impacted upon by construction lighting due to the phrase used 'as is reasonably practicable'. There is currently no information regarding any requirement for operational lighting other than it will be on motion sensors and directed inwards. We would therefore like to see a commitment to the retention of dark corridors for bats, as evidenced by the results of the bat surveys.	NO	Construction temporary site lighting, in the form of mobile lighting towers with a power output of 8 kilo volt-amperes (kVAs), will be required in areas where natural lighting is unable to reach (sheltered/confined areas), and during core working hours within winter months. Artificial lighting will be provided to maintain sufficient security and health and safety for the construction site, whilst adopting mitigation principles to avoid excessive glare, and minimise spill of light to nearby receptors (including ecology and residents), outside of the Order limits as far as reasonably practicable. All construction lighting will be deployed in accordance with the following recommendations to prevent or reduce the impact on human and ecological receptors: a. The use of lighting will be minimised to that required for safe site operations; b. Lighting will utilise directional fittings to minimise outward light spill and glare (e.g. via the use of light hoods/cowls which direct light below the horizontal plane, preferably at an angle greater than 20° from horizontal); and c. Lighting will be directed towards the middle of the construction site rather than towards the boundaries. These measures are included in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. During operation, permanent lighting with motion sensors will be installed within the substations and BESS compounds, providing a

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			maximum of 50 lux. Any night works required on the PV modules during operation will use mobile lighting towers. These measures are included in Appendix 16F Framework OEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has committed in the Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] to undertake updated species surveys prior to construction commencing to confirm the status of species identified. This will help inform mitigation measures such as the placement of lighting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Table 8-11 is seriously flawed with direct repercussive effects on all wildlife. Loss and displacement of habitat being treated as low to minor adverse meaning NO significant effect.	NO	Table 8-11: Summary of Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect (Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) for Sunnica East Site has been informed through wildlife and habitat surveys. All wildlife and habitat surveys met appropriate guidelines and the methodology as outlined in Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	In the first list, hedgehogs are described as abundant. In the second list, they are listed as 'No – not taken forward for detailed assessment. Hedgehogs are nationally in rapid decline, so, if they are abundant in the proposed development, then I would think this is significant to assess what will happen to them with the development.	NO	The presence of hedgehogs was identified as likely within the Order limits. Whilst in decline, Hedgehog is widespread and abundant in the UK and in Cambridgeshire and Suffolk. They have therefore been considered and it is not anticipated that the Scheme will have an adverse impact on the hedgehog population. Precautions during construction will be implemented through a Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Further measures to prevent and reduce impacts on wildlife and existing habitats are provided within Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Appendix 8H: Breeding bird surveys indicates there is a notable assemblage of breeding Species of Principal Importance associated with farmland. Assumptions are made that the majority of this assemblage will be retained, with the exception of ground nesting birds such as skylark, for which is acknowledged that compensatory habitat is required. However, there is insufficient evidence presented to demonstrate that there would not be an impact on this group, both during construction and when operational, so a more detailed impact assessment and mitigation strategy is required.	NO	The potential impact on breeding birds is assessed within Appendix 8I [EN010106/APP/6.2] of Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The population of Skylark in both Suffolk and Cambridgeshire are likely to be of district importance. The construction of the Scheme will lead to the loss of arable habitat, used by breeding bird species such as Skylark, although the amount of permanent habitat loss has been minimised as far as reasonably practicable. The loss of any arable habitat is likely to result in temporary displacement of ground-nesting breeding bird species reliant on this habitat and will require replacement habitat. Retained habitats, such as hedgerows and woodland, will maintain occupation of species using them and therefore the majority of breeding bird species found across the Site will not be affected. The construction of the Scheme will be undertaken over many months and will not impact upon retained habitats used by breeding birds, such as woodland and hedgerows, which will maintain connectivity across the Site for the majority of breeding bird species. Therefore, there will be no fragmentation of habitats used by breeding birds. Best practice construction methods as detailed in the CEMP will include implementation of measures to minimise noise, lighting and vibration disturbance to breeding birds to ensure that, where construction of the Scheme is undertaken within the bird breeding season (typically March to August inclusive), then disturbance to breeding birds in adjacent and retained habitats will not occur.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The construction of the Scheme, if undertaken within the bird breeding season (typically March to August inclusive) has the potential to cause mortality to breeding birds in habitats that are to be removed. Where construction cannot avoid nesting birds, then nesting bird checks will need to be undertaken by an ornithologist prior to construction (where this occurs within the breeding season) to ensure there is no species mortality. Therefore, there will be no species mortality of any breeding bird species associated during construction of the Scheme. There are no pathways (e.g. habitat loss or disturbance to breeding birds such as noise, lighting or visual), during operation of the Scheme which could affect breeding birds. Whilst existing arable habitat within the Scheme will be lost during construction (see above), arable habitat between the solar arrays will be converted to grassland habitat, which will be beneficial to invertebrates and species, such as Skylark, that prey on them. Grassland habitat will also provide long-term opportunities for Skylark (and other ground-nesting species) to forage and nest. 292ha of land within the Order limits will be planted with native grassland, trees and hedgerows. A proportion of this will be managed as biodiverse grassland, suitable for breeding farmland birds such as Lapwing and Skylark and providing landscape scale benefits for pollinators through increased habitat provision and connectivity. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] outlines the landscape and biodiversity impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Scheme, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Scheme is operational.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	There is no certainty provided within the texts that creation of some habitats is feasible given previous land use, nutrient status, and topography. Further detail is required. This uncertainty, combined with the use of the words 'reasonably practical' which have been used to consider the retention and creation of some habitats is not appropriate for an impact assessment and does not allow a conclusion of negligible effect including on features of county importance.	NO	The PEI Report represented a snapshot of the Applicant's assessment activity at that time. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments and design development prior to submitting the DCO application. Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES, sets out the measures proposed to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of the Scheme on biodiversity (and landscape) features, and to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value of the Scheme. A variety of habitat types will be created as part of the Scheme in order to (i) improve the existing habitat for species present within the area, (ii) increase the area of improved habitat to increase ranges of species already present, and (iii) increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. By creating new and enhancing existing habitats, this will help to create a more complex ecosystem which in turn will improve the stability of the populations of species within the Site and those 'spilling in' from the surrounding areas. The types of habitat that are proposed to be created / enhanced throughout the Sunnica East and West Sites include: biodiverse grassland, marshy grassland, nesting plots for Stone Curlew, woodland and hedgerow planting. Across the Scheme, the management of solar arrays, particularly margins, located in areas identified for their arable flora, will be managed for rare and scarce arable plants. Other areas of habitat will be managed for overwintering and breeding birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	The Habitat Regulations (HRA) Screening Report (Appendix 8L) concludes in section 3.3.43 that Stone Curlews within the proposed development are not functionally linked to the SPA as they are located over 3km from the Breckland SPA, however, new research has shown that this is no longer the case.	YES	At the time of the Habitats Regulation Assessment undertaken by the Applicant for statutory consultation, the Stone Curlew population within the draft Order limits was not considered functionally linked with the Breckland SPA population. The Applicant accepts this new research and a Habitats Regulation Assessment: Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment accompanies the DCO submission, provided in Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	We consider that full HRA is required due to the functional linkage of Stone Curlews nesting within the area proposed for Sunnica East with the Breckland SPA. This assessment will inform the need for and design of suitable mitigation, or as a last resort and only where the exceptional requirements set out in Regulations 64 and 68 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 are met, of compensatory habitats.	YES	At the time of the Habitats Regulation Assessment undertaken by the Applicant for statutory consultation, the Stone Curlew population within the draft Order limits was not considered functionally linked with the Breckland SPA population. The Applicant accepts this new research and a Habitats Regulation Assessment: Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment accompanies the DCO submission, provided in Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	Consideration should be given in the first instance to the potential for avoidance of impacts on Stone Curlews, in line with the mitigation hierarchy.	NO	The Applicant has adhered to the mitigation hierarchy in development of its proposals. Management will be undertaken in a variety of ways to ensure maximum biodiversity gains. This will be secured through Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the ES. The Applicant has revised the Scheme design following the statutory consultation. Parcels E11 and E23 are no longer proposed for solar development and will provide additional space for Stone Curlew habitat. Parcel E07 is no longer proposed for solar development and will provide further Stone Curlew habitat.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	All proposals to enhance biodiversity need to be included in the LEMP to ensure they are deliverable.	NO	The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain, and the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment sets out how this will be achieved, with reference to the measures set out in the Outline LEMP.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Archaeological assets will be impacted.	NO	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including trial trenching. The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the Order limits. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Spoil management associated with archaeological work should be factored into plans.	NO	Archaeological trial trenching has been undertaken. Spoil generated through this work was managed appropriately and backfilled once the archaeological excavation was complete. Spoil generated through future archaeological works (i.e. likely strip, map and sampling) prior to construction will be managed appropriately. Spoil management practices have been outlined in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The location is not appropriate as it includes archaeologically and culturally important sites.	NO	The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The results of this impact and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including evaluation field work (geophysical survey and trial trenching). The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme including the removal of areas of significant archaeological activity from the Scheme footprint. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Archaeological trenching should take place pre-consent so the nature, extent and significance of archaeological remains is understood, and mitigation can be defined.	NO	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Order limits and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including evaluation fieldwork (geophysical survey and trial trenching). The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	A full archaeological evaluation needs to be completed.	NO	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including evaluation fieldwork (geophysical survey and trial trenching). The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	According to Historic England, the proposal has the potential to cause wholesale destruction to the archaeological landscape.	NO	The Applicant does not agree that the Scheme will cause 'wholesale destruction to the archaeological landscape'. The Applicant has welcomed Historic England's engagement and has continued its EIA activity in light of the responses provided by Historic England and other interested stakeholders. The results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out within the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The area will be permanently inaccessible for archaeological investigation. There may well be another Mildenhall Treasure or other artifacts still awaiting discovery.	NO	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Order limits and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including field evaluation (geophysical survey and trial trenching). The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out within the Order limits. The DCO will also require the Applicant to develop a Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy with stakeholders post-consent.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The PEIR shows that large areas of the site have not been surveyed (217 hectares) and the areas that have been surveyed have not been ground truthed.	NO	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme and has carried out an extensive programme of geophysical surveys and trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including field evaluation (geophysical survey and trial trenching). The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out within the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Given the level of archaeological sensitivity, the SPS is of the opinion that much greater levels of ground truthing survey work must be carried out before the Environmental Statement stage is reached.	NO	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including field evaluation (geophysical survey and trial trenching). The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in revisions to the design of the Scheme and informed the assessments undertaken for ES stage. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out within the Order limits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Any proposals will also need to ensure that they do not adversely impact on the setting of the Roman Villa Scheduled Ancient Monument at this location.	NO	The Applicant has continued its assessment activity following the conclusion of the statutory consultation and has produced an Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which includes reference to Scheduled Monuments as visual receptors in its Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. This can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. The Scheme has been assessed to have a very low impact on the setting of the Roman Villa south of Snailwell Fen. The overall effect is considered to be minor adverse and is not permanent.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Buried archaeology also needs to be considered when operating the Open Cut trenching system.	NO	The Applicant will have regard to buried archaeology while conducting its construction activity. Mitigation and monitoring measures in regard to cultural heritage have been included in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [APP010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	It is our conclusion that this proposal is not consistent with Policy ENV 6 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.	NO	The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application sets out compliance of the Scheme with local planning policy. The Planning Statement also highlights that local development plans are prepared under the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 (as amended) for the purposes of guiding development at the local and regional scale. Policies within local development plans are therefore designed to be applicable to the management of development projects that are of local or regional significance only and are not directly applicable to NSIPs. Whilst local planning policies are not directly applicable to large scale solar, they do support proposals which provide low carbon energy generation as set out in the ECLP Policy ENV6. As set out in Appendix A to the Planning Statement, the Applicant considers that it is in compliance with this policy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	We will lose the region's cultural heritage.	NO	The Applicant considers that the mitigation measures embedded in the Scheme's design are sufficient to mitigate impacts on identified heritage assets and the region's cultural heritage. The Applicant has continued to refine its Scheme proposals following the statutory consultation including its mitigation strategy for heritage assets. This has included ongoing engagement with Historic England and other interested stakeholders. The Applicant's assessments of the Scheme's impacts on heritage, and its proposed mitigation measures are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The view of the culturally important vista is enjoyed by very many both from the locality and further afield.	NO	A number of viewpoints were prepared as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant's DCO application documents include assessment of the Scheme's impacts on heritage assets through photomontages. These include views to and from of notable designated and non-designated archaeological and historic landscape assets. The photomontages can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Appropriate screening has been developed and implemented to minimise the visual intrusion of the Scheme, while avoiding obscuring or intruding upon views and relationships between heritage assets. Any mitigation planting has taken into consideration the surrounding landscape character and hedge planting has been favoured over tree planting where appropriate. Appropriate setbacks have also been incorporated into the scheme design, limiting visibility from key routes through the landscape.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The Scheme does not give proper weight to considerations such as heritage.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The Applicant has removed over 90 ha of land where significant archaeological activity has been identified removed from the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in the Scheme. Where avoidance has not been possible, the Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within the Scheme to reduce the impacts on the setting of built heritage and historic landscape assets. The Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including geophysical survey and trial trenching. The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in further revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the proposed Scheme boundary. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The development overshadows Chippenham Park with detriment to its setting.	YES	The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in the vicinity of Chippenham Park RPG has incorporated additional setback from the Avenue at areas W04 and W05. Additional planting along the avenue has also been provided in this area. It is anticipated that planting along the south drive of the Chippenham Park RPG will have matured by year 15 of operation. While the planting will restore part of the avenue, it is not anticipated that it will reduce the impact on the parkland setting. Mitigation planting to the north and east of Sunnica West Site A will have matured by this date, screening the development within views across to the designated area. However, the Scheme will still result in a moderate adverse (significant) effect. Further details are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further details of the Applicant's design as submitted are provided in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] and details of the landscape design and management are provided in Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Damage to some of these buildings/ historic assets is inevitable.	NO	The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The Applicant has removed over 90 ha of land where significant archaeological activity has been identified from the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in the Scheme. Where avoidance has not been possible, the Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within the Scheme to reduce the impacts on the setting of built heritage and historic landscape assets. The Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including trial trenching. The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in further revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the proposed Scheme boundary. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	There will be an impact on heritage assets.	NO	The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The Applicant has removed over 90 ha of land where significant archaeological activity has been identified from the areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in the Scheme. Where avoidance has not been possible, the Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within the Scheme to reduce the impacts on the setting of built heritage and historic landscape assets. The Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including trial trenching. The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in further revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the proposed Scheme boundary. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Will there be an impact on heritage assets?	NO	The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The Applicant has sought to avoid impact on heritage assets throughout the design process. Where avoidance of heritage assets has not been possible, the Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within the Scheme to reduce the impacts on the setting of built heritage and historic landscape assets. The Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in Chapters 7 and 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The proposal is encroaching too close to the avenue leading to Chippenham Hall, affecting its setting.	YES	The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in the vicinity of Chippenham Park RPG has incorporated additional setback from the Avenue at areas W04 and W05. Additional planting along the avenue has also been provided in this area. It is anticipated that planting along the south drive of the Chippenham Park RPG will have matured by year 15 of operation. While the planting will restore part of the avenue, it is not anticipated that it will reduce the impact on the parkland setting. Mitigation planting to the north and east of Sunnica West Site A will have matured by this date, screening the development within views across to the designated area. However, the Scheme will still result in a moderate adverse (significant) effect. Further details are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further details of the Applicant's design as submitted are provided in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] and details of the landscape design and management are provided in Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The area of solar panel development closest to the Chippenham park and garden is Sunnica West Site A. This lies to the south and south-east of the walled park, with an undeveloped buffer zone of agricultural land between the south park boundary and the proposed solar panels. Where the developed area comes closest to the park, on its east side just south of the B1085, a mitigating belt of new tree planting and new native grass planting is proposed.	YES	This is noted. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in the vicinity of Chippenham Park RPG has incorporated additional setback from the Avenue at areas W04 and W05.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The proposed mitigation planting along the avenue to Chippenham Hall should be appropriate (beech) and sufficient to reduce the adverse visual impact of the adjacent solar panels to a minimum or even to zero.	NO	This is noted. The Applicant has further revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The areas where the PV modules and associated infrastructure can be located in the vicinity of Chippenham Park RPG has incorporated additional setback from the Avenue at areas W04 and W05. Additional landscaping has also been provided in this area. This could include native species of local provenance, including Pedunculate Oak, English Elm, Field Maple, Birch and Scots Pine.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The visual impact of the proposed development on the park and garden within the walled boundary will be minimal. The park is bounded by a belt of trees, including many pines, and a brick wall. These form a very complete visual boundary.	NO	Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes an assessment of the view from within the park and garden (viewpoint 31). As stated in the question, due to the extent of the intervening vegetation and boundary wall, the ES predicts the Scheme will not be visible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	There will be a detrimental impact to Fordham Abbey. During construction, access and the visual amenity will be considerably reduced. The location of Site B will impair the visual appeal of the Estate causing a loss of business.	NO	The impact on Fordham Abbey as a result of the Scheme has been assessed as part of the Applicant's assessments on cultural heritage. The Scheme is anticipated to have a very low, minor impact on Fordham Abbey, which is not considered significant. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. This is outlined in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	£11 million has been invested in Fordham Abbey and the proposal could have a negative impact upon investment and future planning.	NO	The impact on Fordham Abbey as a result of the Scheme has been assessed as part of the Applicant's assessments on cultural heritage. The Scheme is anticipated to have a very low, minor impact on Fordham Abbey, which is not considered significant. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction. This is outlined in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the ES[EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Part of the Scheme is over the location of the Isleham plane crash site which is sacred to many villagers.	NO	The area of the Isleham plane crash site has been included within the study area of the heritage assessments (notably Appendix 7C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and has also been subject to geophysical survey and trial trenching, the results of which have been incorporated into the Environmental Statement. However, it is not possible to identify the precise location of the crash through the historical environment record or other documentary sources. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Sunnica East B will build over a historic WW2 airfield which is a popular dog walking area.	NO	The area of the former RAF Snailwell site has been included within the study area of the heritage assessments (notably Appendix 7D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and has also been subject to geophysical survey and trial trenching, the results of which have been incorporated into the Environmental Statement. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant notes that the area in question is on private land and is not open to walkers currently.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	West Site B is on ancient meadowland.	NO	Assessment of the historic landscape of the scheme (including that adjacent to the River Snail within West Site B) has been included in both the desk-based assessment (Appendix 7D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and incorporated into the Environmental Statement itself. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The mitigation proposed will not protect heritage assets from construction and decommissioning.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has developed its proposed mitigation measures by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within the Scheme to reduce the impacts on the setting of built heritage and historic landscape assets. Mitigation and monitoring measures in regard to cultural heritage have been included in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Preliminary measures were outlined in Table 3-2 of the Framework CEMP. This was available during the statutory consultation under Appendix 16C of the CEMP. The Applicant has continued to carry out archaeological assessments including trial trenching. The outcomes of these assessments have resulted in further revisions to the design of the Scheme. Areas for archaeological mitigation have been included within parcels W03, W04, and E33 in support for the conclusions of archaeological surveys carried out in the proposed Scheme boundary.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Nothing to do with the racing industry.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to the Newmarket Conservation Area and the cultural heritage of the horseracing industry. It is considered that the Sunnica Energy Farm will have no impact on these assets. This includes assessments relating to a number of impacts set out below. The full results of the Applicant's assessments carried out in relation to heritage can be found in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant has assessed the impacts of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm including in terms of landscape and visual impact assessment. Further details can be found in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further details including an overview of the potential impacts on the horse racing industry can be found within the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The PEIR refers to documents from the Historic Environment Record which are not up to date.	NO	The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice, its own fieldwork and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities This has meant that we have been able to rely on more than just the Historic Environment Record in the assessment. The results of this impact and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Built Heritage: Paragraph 7.4.1 refers to the study area as being 1km which extends to 5km for higher grade assets. There does not appear to be any explanation for this, and the setting of Grade II listed buildings is protected in the same way as the higher-grade buildings.	NO	Designated heritage assets of the highest significance (as defined in the National Policy Statements and National Policy Planning Framework, namely Scheduled Monuments, Grade I, Grade II* listed buildings or Registered Parks and Gardens) are considered outside of the 1km study area, within an area up to 5km beyond the Order limits. This is in recognition of the distinction drawn within the National Policy Planning Framework of the potential for setting to be influenced over a larger area due to the function and survival of the asset. The Applicant has therefore developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The results of this impact and the Applicant's assessment methodology and proposed mitigation are set out in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	Certain aspects of cultural heritage, local history and artefacts were identified and uncovered during the surveys, the conclusion being that much of this is likely to be lost. The detailed conclusions within the summary document seem to play down a number of these reported conclusions.	NO	The Applicant acknowledges the potential for archaeological deposits to be present within the Scheme and has carried out an extensive programme of trial trenching to investigate whether such deposits are present. The results of these surveys and the Applicant's proposed mitigation in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Heritage	The potential impacts on the designated sites, statutory and non-statutory, are not fully assessed.	NO	The Applicant has developed its assessment of the Scheme's impact on heritage assets by using best practice and in consultation with statutory bodies including Historic England and the local authorities. The results of this impact and the Applicant's proposed mitigation are set out in chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The assessment methodology was outlined in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the PEI Report. The study area was selected to ensure the assessment is proportionate, in accordance with the requirements of the NPS and the NPPF.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Vehicles should be routed along Reach Road to access the site and not through villages.	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1], and no significant impacts are anticipated on transport throughout the Scheme's lifetime. The Applicant has produced a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application which sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The developers should ensure access to the Sunnica West sites should only be via A11/A14 and not through villages.	NO	The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Site East A has its entrance on a dangerous bend on a small lane. This entrance was originally put in place for construction traffic and should not be a permanent route to Site A.	NO	Details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). Swept path analysis and visibility splays have been used to design the access points, and it is considered that this access point is safe for HGV access. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs during construction. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Access could be provided to East Site B from Elms Road on the northern side of the carriageway, approx. 100m NW of the proposed access to the land to the south. There is existing gated access to the land which could be used.	NO	Sunnica East car park is accessed via Elms Road. Details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). Details of the traffic management as well as swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative junction layouts along Elms Road and HGV routes to/from the site accesses is provided in Section 5 and Annex C of the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan which sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	How will construction traffic access the site?	NO	The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan is presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. Details include swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative junction layouts and HGV routes to/from the site accesses. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The primary access point for west site A is via the Chippenham junction of the A11 which is a narrow unclassified country road.	NO	Details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). Details include swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative junction layouts and HGV routes to/from the site accesses. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	To even suggest an entry from the narrow road between Chippenham and Snailwell is beyond my comprehension.	NO	The access point on Chippenham Road will be sited at the existing access to Chippenham Park approximately 500m north-east of the junction with the Street, Newmarket Road and Snailwell Short Road. This is site access B; details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). Swept path analysis and visibility splays have been used to design the access points, and it is considered that this access point is safe for HGV access. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	There is insufficient information with regards your proposed site accesses.	NO	Details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). The information includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative junction layouts and HGV routes to/from the site accesses. The CTMP and Travel Plan also sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	A number of internal access tracks are referred – who will these be accessible to?	NO	Internal access tracks will be used by staff and construction traffic to minimise usage of the local road network. These will not be accessible to the public. The Applicant is proposing a new network of permissive paths within the parts of the Scheme design. These are detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The site accesses are shown on the Access and Rights of Way Plans.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Will the road from Chippenham Road to Sunnica West B be a gated private road or will there be a public access for vehicles and pedestrians?	NO	Internal access tracks will be used by staff and construction traffic to minimise usage of the local road network. These will not be accessible to the public. The Applicant is proposing a new network of permissive paths within parts of the Scheme design. These are detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The site accesses are shown on the Access and Rights of Way Plans.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The Chippenham-Snailwell Road entrance to the Scheme is only used for rare agricultural access and has an extremely attractive avenue of trees that are the joy of the neighbourhood. Industrialising this would be sacrilege.	NO	This viewpoint has been assessed in the landscape and visual assessment as viewpoints 42 and 43 (please see Figure 10-12 [EN010106/APP/6.3] for the viewpoint plan). Viewpoint 42 demonstrates the vegetated character to Chippenham Road due to the linear row of beech trees and that there are close range views of the fields. The visual receptors at this point are motorists using Chippenham Road and are assessed to be of medium value. The visual receptors at viewpoint 43 are Snailwell residents. This receptor has been assessed to be a high value receptor. During construction, both receptors have been assessed to experience a moderate adverse (significant) effect from the presence of construction machinery and construction activities. However, once construction is finished, no effects on the views are anticipated. This is because the PV modules and associated infrastructure in Sunnica West Sites A and B will be offset from Chippenham Road. Landscape planting is proposed to the north-west of Sunnica West Site B to screen views from Snailwell and Chippenham Road. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] and figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Where will the junction on Chippenham Road be sited? The blind bend where current occasional access into the field (used only the farm) is dangerous.	NO	The access point on Chippenham Road will be sited at the existing access to Chippenham Park approximately 500m north-east of the junction with the Street, Newmarket Road and Snailwell Short Road. This is site access B; details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). Swept path analysis and visibility splays have been used to design the access points, and it is considered that this access point is safe for HGV access. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan sets out the measures proposed to control traffic generated by staff vehicles and HGVs. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and to instead focus construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	WB3 Instead of destroying further 'virgin' areas of countryside, road access for any operational activities - should Sunnica West Site B be developed - would more appropriately be sited from Snailwell Road (toward the A142 roundabout) where there is already significant industrialisation of the countryside.	NO	This route was considered for HGV access to Sunnica West Site A, however on Fordham Road/Snailwell Road there is a 7.5 tonne weight restriction the bridge over the River Snail. The bridge is located approximately 150m west of the proposed access to Sunnica West Site B. HGVs accessing Sunnica West Site B will instead access from the A14 to the south, along Snailwell Short Road and through Snailwell. This is shown in Figure 4 of Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	'Active travel' applies to equestrian users and active travel provision must be embedded within the Sunnica Energy Farm.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to this comment. Details on the assessment of and mitigation for 'active travel' are provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The roads can't cope with more traffic- no new infrastructure has been delivered to cope with hundreds of new homes built.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area in its cumulative assessment, which has been undertaken in each of the technical chapters of the ES and summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Appendix 5A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents the shortlist of cumulative schemes that have been considered in the cumulative assessment. The Applicant has assessed the cumulative effects on traffic in the local area in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1], and no significant impacts are anticipated on transport throughout the Scheme's lifetime. A Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] has been prepared as part of the DCO application which sets out how traffic generated by the construction of the Scheme will be managed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Site West A is close to my daughter's school which is on a main road where there are already plans for a large-scale housing development. I'm concerned the extra HGVs will make arriving and leaving school more dangerous than it already is.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impact of transport as part of its Environmental Impact assessment. No significant impacts are anticipated on transport throughout the Scheme's lifetime, including on fear and intimidation as well as accidents and safety. A Transport Assessment has been included as Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. A Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) has been published as part of the DCO application, and contains further information regarding HGV management in Section 6 including HGV routing, which will be directed to use the Strategic Road Network and generally avoid using the local road network. The Applicant has submitted additional information in support of the anticipated arrival and departure patterns of HGVs from the Scheme sites as part of its DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The issues identified in the Suffolk Green Access Strategy with 2.3.2 Create a more connected network – Obtain significant public rights of way improvements and legacies on nationally important development projects, such as Sizewell C’.	NO	The Scheme has been designed to have regard to relevant legislation and policy relating to PRow and green infrastructure. The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design and a network of green infrastructure. These will help improve connectivity between villages. These proposals are detailed in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and in the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan says: "A central action for the updated ROWIP is to improve the network as a whole, making connections with the cycle network and wider transport network. Given the lesser extent of the bridleway network, there is also a real need to provide a better-connected network for horse riders too, as well as walkers, carriage drivers and 4x4 users."	NO	The Scheme has been designed to have regard to relevant policy relating to PRow. The Applicant is proposing to create new permissive routes as part of the Scheme design. These will help improve connectivity between villages. The permissive paths are described in Appendix 10I Landscape and Ecology Management Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has further considered its proposals for permissive routes having regard to the feedback received during the statutory consultation. Further information on the effect of the Scheme on non-motorised users is provided in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has continued to engage with the local authorities following the statutory consultation and is aiming to facilitate additional public access in the area during the Scheme's operating life through the permissive paths it is bringing forward. The nature of the Applicant's land rights do not allow for the creation of permanent PRow but rather provide for permissive path routes for the duration of the Scheme's operating life that must be agreed with the landowners.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Increased traffic and increased noise will affect quality of life for all residents in Barton Mills.	NO	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operation. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects from traffic noise are assessed as a result of the Scheme. The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. This includes requiring construction traffic to travel outside of peak hours to reduce the impact of construction traffic during network peak hours as set out in the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) which has been published as part of the DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. The Applicant has provided details of its proposed mitigation during the construction phase, including measures to limit noise from construction, in the Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Peak commuting hours will have traffic chaos. How do you plan to address this?	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. This includes requiring construction traffic to travel outside of peak hours to reduce the impact of construction traffic during network peak hours as set out in the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) which has been published as part of the DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. .

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Will residents be informed of local road closures, especially those without access to social media and newspapers?	NO	The Applicant is committed to being a responsible neighbour to those living near the Scheme and will continue to engage with the local community should consent be granted. Road closures will be agreed with the local highways authorities. Prior to any road closures advanced warning will be provided in line with the Local Highway Authority (LHA) guidance with diversions in place. This would include the erection of signs to provide prior warning to residents and local road users of upcoming closures. Further information is provided in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Equestrianism is a popular activity in this part of Suffolk and Cambridgeshire, and one which contributes significantly to the local economy. The equestrian community in Suffolk and Cambridgeshire currently has many difficulties in finding safe access within the area, as identified in county policies.	NO	The Applicant has considered potential effects on PRoWs including bridleways. During the operational phase, all existing PRoWs will be retained and will remain accessible. During construction temporary PROW closures will be avoided as far as possible including along the cable route; however, as a worst case scenario it is assumed that each of the affected PROW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction and decommissioning phase. The temporary closures proposed during construction are shown on the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [EN010106/APP/2.4].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Site movements are expected to be so heavy and continuous that Sunnica have asked for onsite fuel storage. How is this to be protected while onsite, how will it be decommissioned?	NO	The Applicant has outlined measures for fuel storage in its Framework CEMP (presented within Appendix 16C of the ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. All fuel will be stored in accordance with COSSH guidelines. The Framework CEMP requires the contractor to produce and implement a Construction Resource Management Plan (CRMP), which will set out targets for fuel, waste and energy consumption. Appendix 16E Framework DEMP of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out information on how the Applicant proposes to decommission the Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Are there any contingencies for leaks and spills of this fuel?	NO	Containment measures for fuel and oil storage have been outlined in the Framework CEMP Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These include standard construction measures such as the use of spill kits, bunds and implementing pollution response plans in the event of an incident. Construction will be carried out by the Contractor using good practice and in line with the legislation, policy and guidance. Assessment and mitigation measures during construction are also provided within Chapters 8 (Ecology) and 9 (Water Resources) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	There seems to be no awareness of the long-term ambition of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Forest Heath District Council to reconnect Mildenhall to Cambridge with the planned Cambridge Autonomous Metro. If these plans are funded, there is the very real possibility that the old route of the Cambridge-Mildenhall railway could form a preferred route for the Metro.	NO	The Applicant has engaged with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority on its proposals for the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM). Discussions held in April and May 2021 indicate that the CAM extension to Mildenhall is at a very early stage and no route options have been determined; the CAM proposals are not therefore sufficiently advanced to enable them to be considered at this stage.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	I fully expect the proposal to make any necessary provisions to facilitate the potential CAM route.	NO	The Applicant has engaged with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority on its proposals for the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM). Discussions held in April and May 2021 indicate that the CAM extension to Mildenhall is at a Mildenhall is at a very early stage and no route options have been determined; the CAM proposals are not therefore sufficiently advanced to enable them to be considered at this stage.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	There will be an increase in accidents due to the impact of heavy vehicles in rural areas.	NO	The Applicant has assessed whether the Scheme will impact on vehicle and non-motorised travellers. The Scheme has been assessed to have no significant impact on accidents and safety for either group. This was outlined in Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the PEIR and has been included in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. Proposals to manage during construction are set out in section 5 and Annex C of the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This includes measures directing construction vehicle movements to predominantly use the strategic road network and to travel to and from the site outside of peak network hours.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	We do not have any form of traffic control and very few footpaths, so any increased traffic will be dangerous for large volume of pedestrians.	NO	The Applicant has assessed whether the Scheme will impact on vehicle and non-motorised travellers. The Scheme has been assessed to have no significant impact on accidents and safety for either group. This was outlined in Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the PEIR and has been included in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] identifies traffic management measures to be used during construction of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Sunnica Energy Farm should include Suffolk and Cambridgeshire's equestrians as vulnerable road users, to ensure that their needs are considered equally alongside those of pedestrians and cyclists.	NO	The Applicant has assessed whether the Scheme will impact on vehicle and non-motorised travellers. The Scheme has been assessed to have no significant impact on accidents and safety for either group. This was outlined in Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the PEIR and is confirmed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	It will disrupt railways over the construction period.	NO	Due to the Scheme's distance from local rail services and the low frequency of services, the impact on local rail services were scoped out of the assessment stage, as staff are unlikely to travel to the Site via rail. In relation to the crossing of the railway by the electrical cable, this will be carried out in close co-ordination with the network operator, Network Rail, so as to avoid any significant adverse effects to the operation of the railway.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The roads around the site are narrow country roads and are unsuitable for heavy traffic.	NO	The Applicant has produced a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the construction of the Scheme travelling through villages and route instead seeks to focus construction traffic to the Strategic Road Network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Mud will be left on local roads.	NO	The Applicant is proposing to install self-contained wheel washes to be used by vehicles prior to exiting the Site onto the public highway if there is mud or debris on the construction site. For loads unable to use the fixed wheel wash, a localised wheel washing would be set up to cater for these individually and as required to ensure no detrimental effect to the highway. This was outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the PEI Report and has also been included in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1], and the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) within the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Multiple roads being dug up between all the affected villages.	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] which includes measures to minimise environmental effects during construction works. The Applicant has produced a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application which includes a requirement to identify of diversion routes where it is necessary to temporarily close roads.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	What is your carriageway debris management protocol for departure from site that has been heavily affected by mud during the winter and prolonged rainfall?	NO	The Applicant is proposing to install self-contained wheel washes to be used by vehicles prior to exiting the Site onto the public highway if there is mud or debris on the construction site. For loads unable to use the fixed wheel wash, a localised wheel washing would be set up to cater for these individually and as required to ensure no detrimental effect to the highway. This was outlined in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the PEI Report and has also been included in Chapter 3 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1], and the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) within the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The repairs must be sympathetic to motorcyclists e.g. limiting manhole covers and avoid ruts.	NO	This has been noted by the Applicant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The routes have no drainage facilities other than gully slips in the verges, increased traffic will increase cost of maintenance and improvement which Sunnica should pay for.	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) which has been published as part of the DCO application details how the Applicant will mitigate impacts from construction traffic. Generally, the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan includes measures that would direct staff vehicles and construction traffic to predominantly use the Strategic Road Network, rather than local roads.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Any newly created passing places should be returned to their original state.	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) which has been published as part of the DCO application details how the Applicant will mitigate impacts from construction traffic. Generally, the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan includes measures that would direct staff vehicles and construction traffic to predominantly use the Strategic Road Network, rather than local roads.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Local roads are already in a bad state of repair and will be made worse by the increase in traffic.	NO	The Applicant is to carry out a highway condition survey before the start of works and is proposing to install a self-contained wheel wash per Site be used by vehicles prior to exiting the Site onto the public highway if there is mud or debris on the construction site. For loads unable to use the fixed wheel wash, a localised wheel wash would be set up to cater for these individually and as required to ensure no detrimental effect to the highway. This was outlined in the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) within our DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	There seems no intention to upgrade the local road network to enable construction with many hundreds of vehicle movements predicted every day.	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) which has been published as part of the DCO application details how the Applicant will mitigate impacts from construction traffic. As a result there is no requirement to carry out improvements to the local road network to accommodate the construction traffic generated by the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	I would hope some road improvements are made to the turnoff from A11 to Newmarket Road/Golf Links Road as it is a very difficult junction.	NO	Within the PEI Report, a site access was identified on Golf Links Road with the HGV route identified via Newmarket Road which avoided the A11/Newmarket Road Junction. However, during the consultation concerns were raised regarding HGVs travelling along Golf Links Road. As part of the site access review, alternative site access locations were investigated. The preferred alternative site access option located on Newmarket Road between the A11 and Golf Links Road was discussed with National Highways regarding development related vehicles using the A11/Newmarket Road Junction. It was agreed that development related vehicles would be permitted to undertake left in and left out movements and would be prohibited to undertake right in and right out movements at the A11/Newmarket Road junction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Often contractors dig up verges and leave them barren to over grow with weeds.	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) which has been published as part of the DCO application details how the Applicant will mitigate impacts from construction traffic. Generally, the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan includes measures that would direct staff vehicles and construction traffic to predominantly use the Strategic Road Network, rather than local roads.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Repairs to the road after HGV traffic will have to be paid for by taxpayers, not Sunnica.	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) which has been published as part of the DCO application details how the Applicant has mitigated impacts from increased construction traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Any approval should include a requirement for significant funds to repair (not patch) the road network when the project is completed.	NO	The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan which has been published as part of the DCO application (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) details how the Applicant has mitigated impacts from increased construction traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The A11 between Red Lodge and roundabout is still not covered with noise reducing tarmacking.	NO	The Applicant is not proposing to provide noise reducing tarmac on the A11 as it is not considered to be relevant to the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The A14/A11 are key growth corridors for Suffolk. With plans for the Cambridge-Norwich tech corridor, we also question how much the proposed Sunnica project would impact on potential employment land around Red Lodge and Mildenhall. A further detailed analysis of this would be needed.	NO	Forthcoming developments (unimplemented planning permissions and development allocations in the Local Plan) are set out and considered in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Will there be a lot of traffic using the back roads from West Row to neighbouring villages? How much and at what times?	NO	The Applicant has produced a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan includes measures directing construction vehicle movements to predominantly use the strategic road network and to travel to and from the project outside of peak network hours. This includes HGV routes to be used. A Transport Assessment has been submitted as part of Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1], presented in Appendix 13B [EN/010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Internal routing is the preferred option as per agricultural traffic.	NO	Internal access tracks will be used by staff and construction traffic to minimise usage of the local road network. These will not be accessible to the public.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Many residents do not have off road parking so there are many cars parked on already narrow roads.	NO	The Applicant is proposing two car parks within the Order limits boundary. This is to reduce the impact on the local road network and parking places. Staff will park at either one of the two centralised car parks and a mini-bus service will transport staff to the required locations making use of internal routes within the site where possible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Concerned about traffic which moves between all sites. To reach the East sites from the West Sites they cannot utilise the A11 directly, perhaps if there were provisions for all traffic to enter the A11 northbound at West Site A for all traffic to flow through the major A road then this would be less of an issue, otherwise we will have a significant number of vehicles moving through Red Lodge village to transition between sites.	NO	The Applicant has produced a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and instead route traffic onto the Strategic Road Network. This includes HGV routes to be used. A Transport Assessment was included as Appendix 13A of the PEI Report and a revised assessment has been submitted as part of Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is proposing two car parks within the Order limits boundary. This is to reduce the impact on the local road network and parking places. Staff will park at either one of the two centralised car parks and a mini-bus service will transport staff to the required locations making use of internal routes within the site where possible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Will there be designated routes for site access?	NO	The Applicant has produced a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and instead route traffic onto the Strategic Road Network. This includes HGV routes to be used. The Applicant is proposing two car parks within the Order limits boundary. This is to reduce the impact on the local road network and parking places. Staff will park at either one of the two centralised car parks and a mini-bus service will transport staff to the required locations making use of internal routes within the site where possible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	In the brochure there is no mention of the roads used during construction.	NO	The Applicant considers it has provided sufficient detail as part of its statutory consultation to enable meaningful consultation. Proposed routes and traffic movements were published within the PEI Report and this information was signposted within the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4). The Applicant has produced a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The plan has been designed to minimise vehicles associated with the Scheme travelling through villages and instead route traffic onto the Strategic Road Network. This includes HGV routes to be used.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The obvious alternative to the Chippenham-Snailwell Road would be to cut W03 and W04 from the Scheme entirely, accessing entirely from within Chippenham Park Land. This looks quite possible from W08 or W06. There are several concrete roads existing and you are laying more access roads - so this could be achieved from the La Hogue Road entrance.	NO	The suggestion has not been taken forward. Since publishing its proposals for statutory consultation the Applicant has undertaken a review of its access proposals. The findings of the access have been published within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Sunnica intend to put a car park on Elms Road.	NO	A car park will be located adjacent to Elms Road. A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) has been produced with details of the staff parking strategy included. The Applicant is proposing two centralised staff car parks within the Order limits. This is to reduce the impact on the local road network and parking places. Staff will park at either one of the two centralised car parks and a mini-bus service will transport staff to the required locations making use of internal routes within the site where possible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Can Sunnica guarantee that none of these staff are going to come into Freckenham down Elms Road? My house is on a sharp bend in the road just before you arrive in the village proper. I have witnessed four accidents on this bend and numerous HGV's becoming stuck.	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. Staff will be to be directed to use the strategic highway network to avoid local villages.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	These HGV's will require some road widening, hedge cutting, and perhaps infrastructure changes to allow for some over size/weight HGV vehicles.	NO	Swept path analysis and visibility splays have been produced to identify areas in which vegetation will need to be cut back along roads to allow access for wide loads or safe visibility. The environmental impact of the vegetation removal, including their potential effects to ecology, have been assessed in the Environmental Statement and are reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The primary access roads for both East sites are narrow, unclassified roads.	NO	Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. All of the proposed accesses are suitable for their intended purposes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Freckenham village roads are not suitable for the traffic proposed.	NO	The roads within Freckenham village will not be used for HGV access to the Sites. HGVs to Sunnica East Site A will be directed from the A11, along Newmarket Road to Worlington, south-east along Freckenham Road before turning north at a junction approximately 300m to the east of Freckenham. These routes are shown in Figure 6 (in Annex A) of Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and TP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The CTMP and TP will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included, which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Approaching East Site A from the west would mean travelling through Isleham which is not suitable.	NO	Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Heavy traffic utilising the Four Cross Bridge would be dangerous as it is a blind spot.	NO	HGVs travelling to and from Sunnica East Site A will be using this junction, but not crossing the bridge itself. HGVs will travel north along the road towards the bridge and turn left (west) along Beck Road just south of the bridge. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	HGVs will not be able to turn at the Walnut Tree Public House junction, which is a 45-degree turn, without breaching the B1102.	NO	It is noted that this comment was also raised during the consultation webinars and following this, the comment was considered further by the transport team. A review of the site accesses (included within Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. These have confirmed that the use of this junction by HGVs is safe during construction. It is proposed that HGVs will use this junction within Worlington for access to Sunnica East Site A. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The "stop" junction at the Walnut Tree Public House is very tight with poor visibility onto the B1102 which carries a steady stream of traffic between Soham and the Fens and Mildenhall and beyond.	NO	It is noted that this comment was also raised during the Sunnica Consultation Webinars. This point was considered further by the transport team. A review of the site accesses (included within Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. These have confirmed that the use of this junction by HGVs is safe during construction. It is proposed that HGVs will use this junction within Worlington for access to Sunnica East Site A. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Construction traffic should not use Malting Lane as it is narrow and has a primary school on it.	NO	HGVs will not travel through Isleham (or along Maltings Lane) to access Sunnica East Site A. HGVs to Sunnica East Site A will be directed from the A11, along Newmarket Road to Worlington, south-east along Freckenham Road before turning north at a junction approximately 300m to the east of Freckenham. These routes are shown in Figure 6 (in Annex A) of Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and TP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Golf Links Road at Worlington is unclassified and unsuitable for HGVs.	YES	HGV access via Golf Links Road has now been removed from the access proposals. Instead, HGVs will access Sunnica East Site B from the A11 northbound slip to Newmarket Road between the A11 and Golf Links Road. An access point (Sunnica East access point I) has been included off Newmarket Road to avoid the need for HGVs to use Golf Links Road. Details of the access routes can be found in Appendix 16C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan, Annex A figures 6 and 7, of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded no significant effects. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Worlington village roads are too narrow and would be dangerous if two lorries passed each other.	NO	Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads in Worlington and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Hedgerows on Elms Road will need to be cut back to help with wide loads.	NO	Swept path analysis and visibility splays have been produced to identify areas in which vegetation will need to be cut back along roads to allow access for wide loads or safe visibility.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The roads around Snailwell are unsophisticated and unsuitable for heavy traffic.	NO	Effects from HGVs and staff vehicles travelling to and from site on Snailwell have been considered in the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The size and rural nature of the roads, in addition to the existing traffic in the area, have been taken into account in the traffic modelling used in the assessment. The assessment has concluded that there will be no significant effects on the roads and residents in Snailwell from construction traffic. The route from the A142 was considered for HGV access to Sunnica West Site A, however on Fordham Road/Snailwell Road there is a 7.5 tonne weight restriction the bridge over the River Snail. The bridge is located approximately 150m west of the proposed access to Sunnica West Site B. HGVs accessing Sunnica West Site B will instead access from the A14 to the south, along Snailwell Short Road and through Snailwell. This is shown in Figure 4 of Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The access point on Chippenham Road will be sited at the existing access to Chippenham Park approximately 500m north-east of the junction with the Street, Newmarket Road and Snailwell Short Road. This is site access B; details of the site access review is contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (presented in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]). The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Traffic to East Site A will be using the Freckenham Road/ West Row which is already problematic and in a poor state of repair.	NO	The route along Freckenham Road has been assessed through swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. This review has found that these are suitable roads for access to Sunnica East Site A. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	There should be no access to any part of a build programme along the B1085 which has a weak rail bridge with 3T weight limit.	NO	It is not clear from this comment which bridge is specifically being referred to. However, only the access routes identified within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]) would be used by construction traffic. Bridges considered too weak to be used for construction traffic have been avoided in the planning of access routes for construction traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The entrance in and out of Dane Hill Farm some 100/150 yards from the proposed entrance is used heavily by residents and very large farm traffic.	NO	Existing traffic has been taken into account in the baseline studies – this includes the traffic around Dane Hill Farm. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. These existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Site works and associate traffic should not use Burwell roads or streets for entry.	NO	During construction, HGVs would access the substation along Ness Road from the north, before joining the High Street in Burwell and travelling south onto Read Road. HGVs will then follow Reach Road to join Weirs Drove, where they will access the Burwell National Grid Substation. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	CPRE are particularly concerned by the effect of this development on the B1085 Dane Hill Road and Station Road.	NO	The B1085 Dane Hill Road and Station Road have been included within the assessment in presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], which has concluded that there will be no significant effects from increased construction traffic. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	No account seems to have been taken of the fact that the B1085 Dane Hill Road and Station Road will be made considerably busier by the construction of 500 houses with access onto this road.	NO	The B1085 Dane Hill Road and Station Road have been included within the assessment in presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], which has concluded that there will be no significant effects from increased construction traffic. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Elms Road is not a major road. It narrows to 4.5 meters at points, has no road markings, and is closed to HGVs. The proposed amount of traffic is unsafe, out of scale with its context, and will over-burden the existing road infrastructure.	NO	Elms Road is not closed to HGVs and has been assessed to be safe and appropriate for the intended use. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Elms Road has no footpath and we must walk on the road. It is not right to change a rural road like this into a thoroughfare for a large-scale construction project.	NO	Effects on fear and intimidation for non-motorised users have been assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	We believe that Golf Links Road will come under severe pressure if a voluminous quantity of construction traffic attempts to pass up and down what is a confined and narrow roadway in a rural setting both during the long construction phases and thereafter during maintenance.	YES	HGV access via Golf Links Road has now been removed from the access proposals. Instead, HGVs will access Sunnica East Site B from the A11 northbound slip to Newmarket Road between the A11 and Golf Links Road. An access point (Sunnica East access point I) has been included off Newmarket Road to avoid the need for HGVs to use Golf Links Road. Details of the access routes can be found in Appendix 16C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan, Annex A figures 6 and 7, of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded no significant effects. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The use of the road by e.g., heavy articulated lorries passing other road users will result in trespass on the verges flanking the road, parts of which verges are owned by the Golf Club.	YES	HGV access via Golf Links Road has now been removed from the access proposals. Instead, HGVs will access Sunnica East Site B from the A11 northbound slip to Newmarket Road between the A11 and Golf Links Road. An access point (Sunnica East access point I) has been included off Newmarket Road to avoid the need for HGVs to use Golf Links Road. Details of the access routes can be found in Appendix 16C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan, Annex A figures 6 and 7, of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. The rural nature of the roads and existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded no significant effects. The Framework CTMP and Travel Plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	I object to the plan to establish the Contractor's site, immediately opposite the drive to La Hogue Farm on La Hogue Road. La Hogue Road is a very small, narrow service road, totally unsuited to heavy traffic on a daily basis, which is what would happen, should this inappropriate scheme proceed.	NO	The access point opposite La Hogue Farm is considered to be suitable for the Applicant's intended use. The Applicant has carried out detailed assessments of its proposed accesses including swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. This includes details of traffic management measures, which may be required to ensure safe entry and exit of construction vehicles during construction and to otherwise manage construction traffic to minimise its effects to local communities and the local highway network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Projects such as this always overrun so there is no knowing when disruption will end.	NO	The Applicant envisages a construction period of two years. This has been considered in the assessment and is considered the worst case scenario as this will condense the number of traffic movements in to a shorter period. Once built, solar farms are quiet neighbours and cause little disruption to their neighbours. The Applicant does recognise that construction is, by its very nature, disruptive and is proposing a number of measures to manage and mitigate this disruption. These measures would be in place for the duration that they are required during construction. Further information on the Applicant's approach to manage construction traffic, including information on HGV routing and on managing trips to/from the Scheme to avoid the highway network peak hours is provided in the Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	1,000 workers travelling each day will cause traffic chaos.	NO	The assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has concluded that there will be no significant effects on local road networks from construction and staff traffic during construction. Due to working hours, the staff will arrive at one of the two centralised car parks between 0600-0700 and depart the site between 1900-2000. This avoids the peak hours for traffic on the local road networks. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan, presented within Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2], as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. The Applicant will encourage lift sharing with colleagues to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from the Site each day. Staff will be directed to use the strategic road network in the vicinity of the Site to minimise the amount of traffic using local roads.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The disruption during the build should be minimal as main roads could be made accessible.	NO	HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. A review of the site accesses is included within Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	My daughter attends Isleham Primary school so would mean daily issues getting to and from school from Red Lodge as this would be right across the areas that Sunnica are proposing to use.	NO	Road closures will be short term (no more than one week) and details contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. Due to the working hours the staff will arrive at one of the two centralised car parks between 0600-0700 and depart the site between 1900-2000. Traffic impacts are contained within Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	How much of the project's HGV and employee related traffic will affect Snailwell? Snailwell has narrow, quiet roads accessed from one side by a narrow bridge and many houses have road frontage and road parking.	NO	Effects from HGVs and staff vehicles travelling to and from site on Snailwell have been considered in the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The size and rural nature of the roads, in addition to the existing traffic in the area, have been taken into account in the traffic modelling used in the assessment. The assessment has concluded that there will be no significant effects on the roads and residents in Snailwell from construction traffic. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The volume of traffic already cutting through is already dangerous and your Scheme just impacts this further.	NO	Traffic studies and models used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. These existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The traffic impact on A11, A142 and other local road networks should be considered.	NO	Traffic impacts on the A11, A142 and local road networks have been considered. The assessment of effects from traffic is included Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	How can you assert that the volume of HGV traffic is proportionate or reasonable in the rural environment?	NO	The assessment of effects from construction traffic has taken into account the rural nature of the road network in the vicinity of the Scheme. Assumptions are included in Section 13.4 and traffic impacts are contained within Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. Chapter 13 is supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Traffic movements will increase as villagers will have to drive out of the affected villages due to public rights of way being de-commissioned during the construction phase.	NO	Public rights of way will not be decommissioned during construction. Some public rights of way will need to be closed for up to three weeks each during construction. Appropriate signage identifying alternative routes on the existing public rights of way network will be provided during temporary closures of public rights of way. A Transport Assessment is provided in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Concerned about increase in traffic during construction due to the need to bring panels, materials and people on site.	NO	Traffic impacts are assessed within Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on the highway network during construction. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	I am going to have to take a further route to my son's school, twice a day, this will cost me a further £2 a day and 1/2 an hour of my time. How much I can expect to be out of pocket due to road closures?	NO	Road closures will be short term (expected to be for no longer than one week). Appropriate measures to manage traffic during temporary closures are contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Concerned about increase in traffic during the decommissioning stage of the programme.	NO	The effects from decommissioning traffic have not been considered in detail in the transport assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This is because it is not possible to predict the baseline traffic conditions during decommissioning (expected to be in 2065). However, the traffic generated during the decommissioning stage is expected to be less or equal to that during the construction phase and the Applicant has committed to employ during decommissioning measures equivalent to those proposed to be used to mitigate construction phase traffic

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Noise and disruption increase on narrow local roads unsustainable.	NO	Traffic studies and models were used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. These existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects during construction. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. The CTMP includes measures that will avoid arrival of vehicles associated with the construction of the Scheme throughout the day to minimise the impact on the local community by avoiding the highway network's peak hours. It is anticipated that the AM and PM Scheme peak hours will be 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00. This reflects the arrival and departure times of the staff. A noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken and provided in Chapter 11 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This has assessed the noise and vibration effects from construction traffic on a number of receptors. No significant effects are predicted on receptors from increased traffic volumes causing an increase in noise or vibration.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Local roads are already used as a rat run for A11 traffic and congestion – unsuitable for a large volume of HGVs.	NO	Traffic studies and models were used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. These existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects during construction. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. The CTMP includes measures that will avoid arrival of vehicles associated with the construction of the Scheme throughout the day to minimise the impact on the local community by avoiding the highway network's peak hours. It is anticipated that the AM and PM Scheme peak hours will be 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00. This reflects the arrival and departure times of the staff.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	There will be an increase of traffic over the 40-year lifespan to maintain the site.	NO	Solar developments generate very few traffic movements during operation. On the advice of the Planning Inspectorate, the impact of traffic during the operational stage was scoped out of preliminary assessments as any increase in traffic is likely to be minimal due to the small number of staff required during the operational phase. The Scoping Opinion is contained within Appendix 1B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The A11 Barton Mills road about is already heavily congested and I can only imagine that the expected additional traffic will make the situation very much worse.	NO	Traffic studies and models were used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. These existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects during construction. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. The CTMP includes measures that will avoid arrival of vehicles associated with the construction of the Scheme throughout the day to minimise the impact on the local community by avoiding the highway network's peak hours. It is anticipated that the AM and PM Scheme peak hours will be 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00. This reflects the arrival and departure times of the staff.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The current road infrastructure of the A142 although allowing for significantly higher traffic flow than the Chippenham Road, already exceeds capacity on occasions, leading to increased traffic and queuing through Snailwell village and onto Chippenham Road.	NO	Traffic studies and models were used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the production of the Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) have used existing traffic flows as the baseline. These existing traffic flows have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects during construction. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. The CTMP includes measures that will avoid arrival of vehicles associated with the construction of the Scheme throughout the day to minimise the impact on the local community by avoiding the highway network's peak hours. It is anticipated that the AM and PM Scheme peak hours will be 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00. This reflects the arrival and departure times of the staff.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The route along the Street in Worlington is straddled by old buildings with footings that will struggle to manage with the vibration and noise caused by this increased traffic volume.	NO	A noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken and provided in Chapter 11 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This has assessed the noise and vibration effects from construction traffic on a number of receptors, including Worlington. Residential properties in Worlington may experience low adverse magnitude impacts, equivalent to a minor adverse effect, which is not significant. This would not equate to any risk of cosmetic or structural damage and simply represents a level at which some vibration may be experienced by people in this location. Therefore, no significant effects are predicted on receptors in Worlington from increased traffic volumes causing an increase in noise or vibration. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. The CTMP includes measures that will avoid arrival of vehicles associated with the construction of the Scheme throughout the day to minimise the impact on the local community by avoiding the highway network's peak hours. It is anticipated that the AM and PM Scheme peak hours will be 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00. This reflects the arrival and departure times of the staff.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	How long will there be excessive Sunnica traffic on the back roads?	NO	HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. Construction traffic will be directed to use the strategic road network to the site accesses as far as possible, but there will be a need for movements on local roads in limited circumstances. For examples, minibus movements and deliveries that cannot be made via the internal roads within the Order limits. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Road closures will be short term (no more than one week) and details contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. Traffic impacts are contained within Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The road into Mildenhall is already affected by construction of Mildenhall Hub which is set to continue for several years into the future.	NO	TEMPro growth factors were applied to the traffic survey data to account for regional traffic growth in the intervening period between surveys and assessment year. The use of the Forest Heath District Council Site Allocation Plan Cumulative Impact Study data and approach was agreed with both Suffolk County Council (SCC) and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), and National Highways (formerly Highways England) during scoping discussions and set out in the scoping opinions responses. Further detail can be found in section 3.4 of Appendix 13B: Transport Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Traffic flows with growth account for have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects during construction. The Applicant has carried out an assessment of traffic impacts, taking into account development planned at Mildenhall. Information has been used from the Forest Heath Local Plan Study. Further information can be found in the Applicant's Transport Assessment in section 3 (Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	What times will there be Sunnica traffic on the roads?	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The CTMP includes measures that will avoid arrival of vehicles associated with the construction of the Scheme throughout the day to minimise the impact on the local community by avoiding the highway network's peak hours. It is anticipated that the AM and PM Scheme peak hours will be 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00. This reflects the arrival and departure times of the staff.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Lessons should be learnt from the significant disruption caused by cable laying from Burwell-Lakenheath in 2019.	NO	This comment is noted. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]) as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Roads through Kennett are already quite busy.	NO	HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Road closures will be short term (no more than one week) and details contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. Traffic impacts are contained within Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has submitted Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Can you provide a traffic management plan including times and dates when road closures or other disruptions will affect local people?	NO	The Applicant has submitted Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes. Road closures will be short term (no more than one week) and details contained within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. Traffic impacts are contained within Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	What checks will be carried out to ensure 'Sunnica' vehicles comply with speed restrictions and primarily use roads designed to bypass local villages?	NO	A Delivery Management System (DMS) will be implemented to control bookings of HGV deliveries from the start of the construction period. This will be used to effectively plan all HGV deliveries in accordance with the construction programme, regulate the flow of HGVs via timed delivery slots and monitor compliance of HGV routeing. A Traffic Management and Monitoring System (TMMS) will be developed. The TMMS will provide details of the technologies and other means employed to monitor HGVs to/from the development site (e.g. Global Positioning System (GPS), Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR)). This will enable the Applicant to monitor the following: a. compliance with the HGV routes; b. compliance with the number of HGV limits in terms of number of deliveries arriving and departing at any one time and over the course of the day; and c. compliance with the timing restrictions. The precise form of DMS would be determined following the appointment of an experienced contractor and will include a summary of the contractual requirements which those visiting the site will have to adhere, along with the measures to be taken for non-compliance. This could include implementing a three-strike system for contractors which could lead to financial penalties.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Further details on construction traffic management can be found in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	How many HGVs are predicted?	NO	The Applicant has included these predicted HGV movements in Chapter 3 and Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13B) [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Suffolk Chamber of Commerce has for several years been leading on a campaign to improve the A14 in Suffolk which currently suffers from congestion, a high percentage of HGVs, accidents, and frequent tailbacks at key junctions including 37 at Exning. We welcome the aspiration of ensuring staff arrive on site between 6-7am and leave after peak hours, however, we suspect that other vehicles, deliveries, and contractors would be coming to the site throughout the day and would cause additional strain on this part of the road network. Further transport analysis including junction modelling of the impacts on the A14 would be welcome, as would additional funding to help with junction improvements especially at those most affected, such as 37, if the scheme is shown to have a detrimental impact.	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. Where practicable the CTMP will stagger the arrival of vehicles associated with the Scheme throughout the day to minimise the impact on the local community. It is anticipated that the AM and PM Scheme peak hours will be 06:00-07:00 and 19:00-20:00. This reflects the arrival and departure times of the staff. The Applicant has embedded significant mitigation within Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1], and no significant impacts are anticipated on transport throughout the Scheme's lifetime. This includes the A14 and Junction 37. The Applicant has submitted Appendix 13C Framework CTMP of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. The Applicant will appoint a Travel Plan Co-ordinator to oversee management, monitoring and implementation of the CTMP and the Construction Worker Management Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	A comprehensive travel plan to cover the whole construction period needs to be produced.	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan within Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. This will establish measures that will minimise the potential for adverse effects throughout construction, arising from HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Will there be traffic light systems in place whilst work is carried out?	NO	At some access points around the Scheme, temporary traffic lights will be required to ensure safe entry and exits for HGVs during construction. A review of the site accesses is included within Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [EN010106/APP/2.4] sets out the locations of the proposed temporary traffic signals.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	How many vehicles are involved for the transportation of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) that will not be compliant with the latest emission standards?	NO	The Applicant has committed in Appendix 13C Framework CTMP of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] to require as far as possible that all HGVs routing to the development sites (with the exception of vehicles used for the transportation of abnormal loads) to be compliant with the latest emission standards. The Applicant has submitted a lifecycle GHG emissions assessment within Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], as part of its DCO application. This includes emissions from vehicles during construction. The Scheme is anticipated to have a major beneficial impact on the climate through the generation of renewable energy.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Would like to know more information about vehicle movements and proposed access points to the site.	NO	Traffic impacts are contained within Chapter 13 of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and supported by the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Constructing the site will close roads and cause delays which will harm the local area.	NO	The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. This presents measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. The Applicant has assessed the impact and significance of effects on vehicles arising from construction of both sites. Road closures will only be implemented where other measures are not possible, and these will be temporary.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Building of Kennett Garden Village will take place at more or less the same time period as Sunnica Solar Farm so there needs to be careful coordination that construction traffic does not interfere with each other.	NO	TEMPro growth factors were applied to the traffic survey data to account for regional traffic growth in the intervening period between surveys and assessment year. The use of the Forest Heath District Council Site Allocation Plan Cumulative Impact Study data and approach was agreed with both Suffolk County Council (SCC) and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), and National Highways (formerly Highways England) during scoping discussions and set out in the scoping opinions responses. Further detail can be found in section 3.4 of Appendix 13B: Transport Assessment of this Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Traffic flows with growth account for have therefore been taken into account in the transport assessment, which has concluded that there will be no significant effects during construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The construction site staff arrival at 6.00am are they going to switch their cars off and sit in their cars quietly until 7.00am, what are they going to do between 6.00am and 7.00am? The construction staff leaving site at 8pm are they going to sit in their cars at 7.00pm quietly and not start their cars until 8.00pm, what are they going to do between 7.00pm and 8.00pm?	NO	The working hours are anticipated to be 07:00 to 19:00, therefore it is forecast that the construction staff will travel to the site between 06:00 and 07:00 and depart between 19:00 and 20:00. Detail of staff arrivals and departures are included within Appendix 13C Framework CTMP and Travel Plan of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	Laying the cable routes will cause traffic chaos.	NO	The transport assessment has determined there would be no significant impacts to the road network as a result of construction of the Scheme, including laying the cable routes. More information can be found in Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN/010106/APP/6.1] of the ES, and the Transport Assessment presented in Appendix 13B of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	The reason why there is no accurate HGV data for Elms Road is because the local road is not classified and unfit for HGV traffic - this would be a major adverse change.	NO	Elms Road is not closed to HGVs, and has been assessed to be safe and appropriate for the intended use. The Applicant has submitted a Framework CTMP and Travel Plan in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.2] as part of its DCO application. The management plan will be adhered to by those travelling to and from the site. This will establish measures that will minimise the volume of HGV and staff traffic so far as reasonably practicable, and the impacts on the local community. HGVs will be routed away from local villages as far as possible and will make use of the strategic road network. A review of the site accesses is included within the Framework CTMP and Travel Plan (Appendix 13C of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2] which includes swept path analysis, visibility splays, indicative site access layouts and HGV routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Transport	There seems to have been no traffic studies undertaken for the construction period to understand the impact.	NO	Traffic studies and modelling have been undertaken to inform the assessment presented in the ES. Details of these are contained within Chapter 13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] as well as the Transport Assessment (presented in Appendix 13B of the ES) [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The Scheme is too close to Lee Brook and other watercourses with a risk of chemicals.	NO	The PV modules will be offset from all watercourses with at least 10m buffer zone in the design, measured from water's edge/channel under normal flow conditions. Therefore there will be little risk within construction for the watercourses. The PV modules themselves are of robust construction, with little risk of any leakage. The Applicant has had regard to watercourses in proximity of the Scheme throughout the design process. Impacts on watercourses have been assessed as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment, which are detailed in Section 9.8 of Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There are no significant effects anticipated to watercourses or ecology as a result of the Scheme. All watercourse within the Order limits will be retained and measures embedded within the Scheme design to protect retained habitats during construction. A Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] is submitted as part of the DCO application which will adopt standard environmental protection measures during construction, such as dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, pollution during construction will not affect water quality and therefore, wildlife which use the watercourse.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resource s	Underground waterways will be polluted.	NO	The potential effect on groundwater quality and Source Protection Zones was considered within the assessment for each site as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment. No significant effects are anticipated on groundwater, underground waterways or watercourses. The assessment findings are included within Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. Standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP The Framework CEMP is presented in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will include pollution prevention measures.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Potential for water supply contamination as the proposed development site runs over a groundwater Source Protection Zone, used for public water supply.	NO	The potential effect on groundwater quality and Source Protection Zones was considered within the assessment for each site as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment. The assessment findings are included within Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. Standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP. The Framework CEMP is presented in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will include pollution prevention measures.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The natural deterioration of panels or damage during construction or from storms, wildlife, or vandalism would all result in the potential contamination of protected water supplies and local rivers.	NO	The Scheme will have an Environmental Management Plan in place for the operation and maintenance of the Scheme. This will include measures to regulate environmental effects of the operational phase of the Site. The Framework OEMP is included in Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The detailed Plan will include a regular schedule for visually inspecting the PV modules, ensuring that the structural integrity of the PV modules will be regularly observed. The PV modules are constructed in a robust manner and their components cannot be separated except with a considerable mechanical load. Therefore, the risk of any liquid leakage from the PV modules is very low, especially in any large quantities. This is stated in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The site will be secured by security measures, plus all the PV modules are offset by at least 10m from watercourses - as measured from the waters edge/edge of channel under normal flow conditions. All site drainage is directed through SuDS features, which provide water quality benefits.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Sunnica East A borders a water course on both sides risking large scale contamination.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to watercourses in proximity of the Scheme throughout the design process. Impacts on watercourses have been assessed as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment. There are a number of embedded mitigation measures which are detailed within Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. Standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP. The Framework CEMP is presented in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention measures. Pollution risk during operation is low, with PV modules set back by at least 10m from watercourses, measured from the waters edge/channel under normal flow conditions, and the implementation of an Environmental Management Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The hazardous materials used in construction are not easy to recycle and can contaminate drinking water if solely discarded with other electronic waste.	NO	Toxic and hazardous waste will be treated by an authorised operator, and the transportation of hazardous waste will also require an authorised carrier. Materials are to be dealt with in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) - a Framework CEMP has been submitted with the DCO Application, provided in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. A Construction Resource Management Plan will be produced prior to construction, which will provide further details of waste management, including toxic and hazardous waste. Chapter 9 Flood Risk, Drainage and Water Resources in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses the potential for water resource contamination during construction and decommissioning. Mitigation measures during construction and decommissioning will be adopted to ensure that any potential for contamination is avoided and reduced. These are outlined in the Framework CEMP and the Framework DEMP in Appendices 16C and 16E respectively of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	We envisage considerable disruption over the next 3 years through rivers and drains.	NO	Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise disruption to the watercourses in the area. The use of drilling underneath the base of the majority of watercourses to a depth of at least 2m below the bed will be used. The embedded mitigation measures, and details of which watercourses would be crossed by intrusive and non-intrusive techniques is included in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The use of open SuDS features to route runoff towards a basin is acceptable. All features are shallow, which is satisfactory and follows Environment Agency groundwater criteria and local guidance on open SuDS.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	More should be done to the number of unique river life forms to the area that are in decline.	NO	There are no significant effects anticipated to watercourses or ecology as a result of the Scheme. All watercourses within the Order limits will be retained and measures embedded within the Scheme design to protect retained habitats during construction. A Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] is submitted as part of the DCO application which will adopt standard environmental protection measures during construction, such as dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, any pollution during construction will not affect water quality and therefore, wildlife which use the watercourses.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Cable laying under the River Kennett should not have an environmental impact.	NO	For the cable route crossing of the River Kennett, trenchless techniques such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling methods will be undertaken. The use of drilling underneath the base of the majority of watercourses to a depth of at least 2m below the bed will be used, so the watercourse itself will not be disturbed. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise disruption to the watercourses in the area. The embedded mitigation measures, and details of which watercourses would be crossed by intrusive and non-intrusive techniques is included in Chapters 3 and 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The local watercourses currently support otters.	NO	There are no significant impacts anticipated on otters, other wildlife or watercourses as a result of the Scheme. The construction of the Scheme will avoid watercourses where otters were recorded, and these will be retained and enhanced where possible. There will be no loss of habitat used by otters anywhere in the Order limits. This is detailed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Lee Brook is used by wildlife which will be disturbed by the Scheme.	NO	There are no significant effects anticipated to watercourses or ecology as a result of the Scheme. All watercourses within the Order limits will be retained and measures embedded within the Scheme design to protect retained habitats during construction. A Framework CEMP (Appendix 16C) [EN010106/APP/6.2] is submitted as part of the DCO application which will adopt standard environmental protection measures during construction, such as dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, pollution during construction will not affect water quality and therefore, wildlife which use the watercourse.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Some housing in this area has been turned down due to the flood areas.	NO	The Applicant has embedded a range of mitigation measures within the Scheme design to reduce potential impacts on the water environment. This includes removing infrastructure from Flood Zone 3b areas and the implementation of swales/drainage ditches. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement at Appendix 9C [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The FRA demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase flood risk within or surrounding the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resource s	Our roads flood very quickly.	NO	A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement at Appendix 9C [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The FRA demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase flood risk within or surrounding the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Concern that compacting land may increase flood risk as land is less absorbent.	NO	Soil compacted during construction that is not being built on will be planted with native grassland, hedgerow or trees. This will improve aeration in the soil. Details on the planting and management of the habitat created are provided in Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has embedded a range of mitigation measures within the Scheme design to reduce potential impacts on the water environment. This includes removing infrastructure from Flood Zone 3b areas and the implementation of swales/drainage ditches. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement at Appendix 9C [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The FRA demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase flood risk within or surrounding the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The substation is in a flood risk area so will need protection from climate change.	NO	According to the East Cambridgeshire District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) modelling and subsequent mapping, the Burwell National Grid Substation Extension lies within Flood Zone 1. According to the online long-term flood risk flood map, the site lies within Flood Zone 2, although the Environment Agency online mapping suggests the site is in Flood Zone 3a (defended). The recent (2017) East Cambridgeshire District Council SFRA mapping, which takes into account current day climate change predictions, is considered to supersede the online mapping. This was confirmed in consultation with the Environment Agency. The substation site will have no structures that would be occupied; with staff generally attending only at times of inspection and maintenance. Any building compounds will be located within Flood Zone 1, taking into account the current climate change mapping extents. The Applicant has embedded a range of mitigation measures within the Scheme design to reduce potential impacts on the water environment. This includes removing infrastructure from Flood Zone 3b areas, the implementation of swales/drainage ditches and raising PV modules to 0.85m above ground level in areas at risk of flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement at Appendix 9C [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The FRA demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase flood risk within or surrounding the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	West Site B appears to be wet at present and there are serious doubts about its suitability for the use now intended.	NO	This area of land adjacent to the River Snail will be planted with native wetland habitat (a total of 26ha). The PV modules and associated infrastructure in Sunnica West Site B will be located away from the floodplain. PV modules will be raised by 0.85m above ground level in areas of flood risk. The majority of the Scheme is in low flood risk areas and so is suitable for the development proposed. In relation to those parts of the project that are in higher flood risk areas, the FRA provided in Appendix 9C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] sets out how the project meets the relevant policy requirements that would justify development on land that is at higher flood risk. The FRA demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase flood risk within or surrounding the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Given the large scale of the site insufficient evidence and explanation has been given regarding the impact on the local watercourses	NO	The Applicant has had regard to watercourses in proximity of the Scheme throughout the design process. Impacts on watercourses have been assessed as part of the Applicant's impact assessments. No significant effects are anticipated during construction, operation or decommissioning of the Scheme. The assessment is detailed in Section 9.8 of Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The native grassland/wetland above E11 and E12 and the adjacent landscape offset could easily have a lake added to encourage biodiversity and a bird watching hide with permissive routes to and from Worlington and the main Worlington to Freckenham Road.	NO	This recommendation is noted. The Applicant has revised the design of the Scheme following the Statutory consultation, but this suggestion will not be taken forward. A total of 292ha of land within the Order limits will be set aside for habitat creation through native grassland, wetland, tree and hedgerow planting. An updated Scheme description has been submitted as part of the DCO application (Chapter 3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]). Enhancement measures have been informed by the extensive field surveys the Applicant has commissioned.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The blue areas around W01 and W02 could be developed into a wetland area similar to the areas of Wicken Fen and the Great Fen Project.	NO	The area around parcels W01 and W02 has been proposed for native grassland and wetland habitat restoration and creation. The Applicant has published proposals for habitat creation and restoration within Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The layout of these is shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	How will chemicals leaching into the soil and waterways be monitored?	NO	The Scheme will have an Environmental Management Plan in place for the operation and maintenance of the Scheme. The Framework OEMP is included in Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. This includes measures to regulate environmental effects of the operational phase of the Site, including measures to manage the risk from pollution from small leaks and spillages from proposed infrastructure. The Plan will include a regular schedule for visually inspecting the PV modules, ensuring that the structural integrity of the PV modules will be regularly observed. The PV modules themselves are constructed in a robust manner and their components cannot be separated except with a considerable mechanical load. Therefore there the risk of any liquid leakage from the PV modules is low. This was detailed in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There is no requirement for monitoring to take place. The fields are currently arable, and regularly sprayed with agro-chemicals. There would be no requirement for use of agro-chemicals for the operational Scheme. Therefore, the Scheme would result in an improvement from the baseline in this respect. The risk of pollution during construction works will be managed by the contractor, using best practice measures. A Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C [EN010106/APP/6.2] has been produced and lists the measures that would be adopted during construction to prevent and manage pollution incidents.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The Scheme is too close to the River Lark.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to watercourses in proximity of the Scheme throughout the design process. Impacts on watercourses have been assessed as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment, which are detailed in Section 9.8 of Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Sunnica East A is approximately 175m from the River Lark at its closest point. There are two tributaries to the River Lark, which flow into the River Lark 900m and 942m downstream from Sunnica East B. Therefore, it is not anticipated to have any significant impact on the River Lark throughout its lifetime.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	The Scheme is too close to the River Snail.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to watercourses in proximity of the Scheme throughout the design process. Impacts on watercourses have been assessed as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment, which are detailed in Section 9.8 of Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme is not anticipated to have any significant impact on the River Snail throughout its lifetime. Pollution risk during operation is low, with PV modules set back by at least 10m from watercourses, measured from the waters edge/channel under normal flow conditions, and the implementation of a Framework OEMP (Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement) [EN/010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	Will the project impact water levels in Chippenham fen?	NO	No impacts are anticipated on groundwater flow to Chippenham Fen as all structures are anticipated to be above the Chalk aquifer water table. The fens are supported by groundwater flow which will not be impacted by the Scheme. The fens are not supported by surface water overland flow, as there is little/no overland flow in a chalk landscape. The Applicant has had regard to watercourses in proximity of the Scheme throughout the design process. Impacts on watercourses have been assessed as part of the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. The drainage strategy, as part of the Flood Risk Assessment [EN/010106/APP/6.2], appended to Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP6.1] has carried out an assessment of hydrological connectivity. This is also discussed in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1]. No impacts are anticipated on groundwater flow to Chippenham Fen as all structures are anticipated to be above the Chalk aquifer water table.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resource s	Will there be the scope for water reservoirs in the development?	NO	The Applicant has not included water reservoirs as part of the Scheme design. However, there is an existing water reservoir within the Order Limits boundary in the fields south of Elm's Lane.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	A water main runs under the 204/5 and Anglia Water requires regular access along it. At the time of writing, Snailwell is suffering from a failure of water supply and there is a fleet of Anglia Water trucks using the Icknield Way to gain access to the repair point. The PRow would have to be kept open and clear for emergency access in any event.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	There is no discussion of potential interactions between dust suppressant measures and water supply.	NO	Where hydrological connections are identified, standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP. The Framework CEMP is presented in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention measures. The water supply to be used for dust suppression is yet to be determined by the contractor. The contractor will ensure the use of a suitable water supply, which may be from an agricultural irrigation reservoir or other potable supply, but will not be abstracted from local watercourses.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Water resources	There is inadequate assessment of the potential for a likely significant effect on the hydrological features of the adjacent Fenland SAC and the hydrological chapter provides no basis to assess this.	NO	Potential impact on hydrological features of Fenland SAC were assessed. The drainage strategy, as part of the Flood Risk Assessment (in Appendix 9C of the Environmental Statement) [EN010106/APP/6.2] includes a section on Impact on SSSI sites. This states that the surface water drainage from the site nearest to the SAC drains away from the site. The fens are supported by groundwater flow which will not be impeded by the scheme. The fens are not supported by surface water overland flow, there is little runoff/overland flow in a chalk landscape. Perennial discharge from groundwater rather than episodic runoff supports the fenland. No impacts are anticipated on groundwater flow to Chippenham Fen as all structures are anticipated to be above the Chalk aquifer water table. Standard environmental protection measures will be implemented and adopted during construction, formalised through a CEMP. The Framework CEMP is included in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.2]. These measures will include dust suppression and pollution prevention. Consequently, indirect effects to designated sites during construction will not occur and there will be no effect to the integrity of any statutory designated sites. Appendix 8M of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] provides the Habitats Regulations Assessment, which assesses the effect on European designated sites.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The applicant should consider the issue of electromagnetic fields in relation to human health, in consultation with Public Health England. Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) highlights that whilst putting cables underground eliminates the electric field, they still produce magnetic fields, which are highest directly above the cable and can have both direct and indirect effects on human health.	NO	All items carrying some form of electrical voltage or current are subject to electric and magnetic fields. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Scheme did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England was consulted at this stage and raised no concerns.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The paperwork does not contain any reassurance on the health implications of being surrounded by high voltage cabling.	NO	All items carrying some form of electrical voltage or current are subject to electric and magnetic fields. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Scheme did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England was consulted at this stage and raised no concerns.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Although the current terrorism threat to national infrastructure is characterised as generally limited and often aspirational, what security measures has Sunnica put in place to mitigate a spectrum of terrorist threats now and during the life of the energy farm? The energy farm could be classified as a 'soft' target offering terrorists increased success in achieving their aim.	NO	The design includes security measures, including fencing, CCTV cameras and lighting in critical areas. These are outlined in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and will continue to be developed during the detailed design phase. The Scheme will not process or include large scale chemicals. The Scheme is not anticipated to have an effect on the risk of a major accident occurring as a result of criminal damage through its lifetime. This is outlined in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure has recommended higher levels of effective and visible protective security at national infrastructure sites to deter potential terrorist threats. Is this a security measure Sunnica is going to provide over the next 40 years? If not why? Who will provide the necessary security to our community?	NO	As part of the Applicant's preliminary environmental assessments, the Applicant has assessed the risk of criminal damage. The design includes security measures, including fencing, CCTV cameras and lighting in critical areas. These are outlined in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and will continue to be developed during the detailed design phase. The Scheme will not process or include large scale chemicals. The Scheme is not anticipated to have an effect on the risk of a major accident occurring as a result of criminal damage through its lifetime. This is outlined in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Batteries are susceptible to thermal runaway and cause fires and explosions.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6], that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. The Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Having looked at other fires involving Lithium-ion BESS there has been talk of an exclusion zone around the BESS, my property would likely be within this zone, yet Sunnica have not put a zone in place.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6], that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Additionally, the Applicant has submitted an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	While the battery stores are separated throughout the Solar site what is in place to reduce the risk of these battery centres catching fire, exploding and harming the area and residential sites around.	NO	The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6], that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Lithium battery storage – little information is provided about this. What chemistry is being used?	NO	The Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] confirms that batteries selected for use on the Scheme will be from UK tier 1 manufacturers and will utilise lithium-ion chemistry. Each battery being procured and installed will be fully sealed by design and has no free electrolyte. The lithium-ion batteries will be either NMC (Nickel Manganese Cobalt) or Lithium Iron Phosphate (LiFePO ₄) chemistry.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The Health and Safety Executive should be involved in assessing all aspects of the risks to health, safety and the environment that these installations will pose.	NO	The Health and Safety Executive was consulted as part of the statutory consultation. The Applicant will continue to have regard to guidance from relevant stakeholders throughout the detailed design process – a requirement to the DCO requires that the Health and Safety Executive is consulted as part of the approval of the Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has considered risks from major accidents as well as effects on human health from the Scheme, and those assessments have taken on board feedback from relevant consultees, including the Health and Safety Executive, as part of the environmental scoping process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Toxic gas plumes from potential Li-ion 101 battery storage fires will affect the ability of USAF Mildenhall to remain operational.	NO	An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers, the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population, which would include people working at USAF Mildenhall. There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. An Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] is provided with the DCO application and the preparation and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan is also a proposed requirement of the draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	If there is a fire, the toxic fumes will harm residents.	NO	An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers, the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population. There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. An Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] is provided with the DCO application and it has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive . The preparation and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan is also a proposed requirement of the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	If the substation is made bigger, is there going to be an increased risk of a fire?		The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the maximum scheme parameters (which would result in the worst case scenario for the environmental effects). The substations will not be made bigger than those proposed in the design submitted in the DCO Application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	In a rural area such as ours how equipped can the local fire services be to quickly deal with an emergency on the scale of this development?		An Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (BFSMP) [EN010106/APP/7.6] has been submitted with the DCO Application that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The local fire services have both been consulted through the statutory consultation and subsequently through the development of the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan, and their input is reflected in our proposals in order that plans are in place in the unlikely event of an emergency.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The fire services have not been consulted.	NO	Local fire and rescue services were consulted as part of the statutory consultation. An Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (BFSMP) [EN010106/APP/7.6] has been submitted with the DCO Application that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The feedback from the local fire services is reflected in our proposals.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The Liverpool and Arizona fires show that the battery technology is not safe.	NO	The Applicant has had regard to the issues associated with the Arizona fire by considering the recommendations from the DNV GL McMicken Battery Energy Storage System Event Technical Analysis Recommendations Report (2020). Recommendations from this report have been considered, this is reported in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6]. For example, one of the recommendations from this report that we have implemented is provision of a sprinkler or mist system in the container. This is to provide cooling which was not possible on the McMicken site because a gas suppression system was used. We are not aware of any publication which has investigated the cause of the Liverpool fire to date, so it has not been possible to consider any issues associated with the Liverpool battery design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	If a catastrophic event occurs at another BESS site, this could flag safety concerns for the Sunnica BESS installations. In the worst case, residents could be left at risk and potentially unable to insure or sell their properties because of that perceived risk.	NO	There is no evidence to support the claim that properties located near to BESS installations are any more difficult to sell or insure than other properties. There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Additionally, the Applicant has submitted an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Battery storage systems should be housed in warehouses to allow for fire suppression techniques to be applied.	NO	The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Further information on the BESS is provided in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Further information on fire safety measures is provided in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Could we be living under an ash cloud?	NO	It is assumed that this comment is relating to a cloud resulting from battery fire. There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Additionally, the Applicant has submitted an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The assessment has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Even acute exposure to hydrogen fluoride can have long-term health effects, such as severe burns, respiratory damage, blindness, major internal organ failure and in severe cases, death.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers, the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	East Anglia has amongst the lowest rainfall in the country hence the prospect of these rural fires spreading and being windborne potentially causing wildfires.	NO	The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	There is no information on plans for if the facility catches fire.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Additionally, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	There is insufficient information given about the number and size of BESS and the impact on the local population should a fire or explosion occur.	NO	There are three BESS Compounds, one in each of Sunnica East A, Sunnica East B, and Sunnica West A, with indicative footprints of the BESS compounds being up to: Sunnica East A: 65,938m²,- Sunnica East B: 161,669m²,-Sunnica West A: 82,923m².,Further details are provided in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]. There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Additionally, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The outline safety plan should have been available during the consultation.	NO	The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. The Applicant has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, at which time members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by making a relevant representation, and there would be further opportunities to comment subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Outline Fire Management Plan to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Sunnica clearly know very little about the BESS technology.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The design of the Sunnica Energy Farm is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Sunnica Energy Farm cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Sunnica Energy Farm has been completed. The Applicant has continued to develop the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the non-Statutory and further following the Statutory consultation. The evolved project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	There is a lack of information on safety and reference to acceptable distance to residential properties.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The BESS component of the Sunnica proposal is so under-specified that it cannot be regarded as a meaningful Consultation.	NO	The Applicant will confirm details of the elements of the Scheme as part of the detailed design that we will prepare if a Development Consent Order (DCO) is granted. It is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed at a later date in the process. Should consent be granted, the Applicant will only be able to build the proposed scheme on the 'developable' area identified for the batteries and within controlled parameters, such as height. These specifications of the area and location of the batteries were published within Chapter 3 (Scheme Description) of the PEI Report in table 3-1 below section 3.3.4 and section 3.4.22 – 3.4.39. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, at which time members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by making a relevant representation, and there would be further opportunities to comment subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Outline Battery Fire Management Plan to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Sunnica advises me the risk assessment for major accidents has been carried out by AECOM on behalf of Sunnica. AECOM are not qualified to give such a risk assessment on BESS which must be done by professionals in the world of battery technology.	NO	Regulation 14(4) of the EIA Regulations 2017 provides that “In order to ensure the completeness and quality of the environmental statement— (a) the applicant must ensure that the environmental statement is prepared by competent experts; and (b) the environmental statement must be accompanied by a statement from the applicant outlining the relevant expertise or qualifications of such experts.” The detail of the relevant expertise or qualifications of the experts who have carried out the assessments in this case is included in Appendix 1C Statement of Competence of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This demonstrates that all assessments in connection with the Scheme have been undertaken by professionals with the relevant experience, expertise and qualifications.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Sunnica have not published a Fire Safety Management Plan which should be scrutinised during the statutory consultation.	NO	The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. The Applicant has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population. All of Sunnica's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the application for examination, at which time members of the local community will be able to comment upon them by making a relevant representation, and there would be further opportunities to comment subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Outline Fire Management Plan to be scrutinised by the local community.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The failure to state a basic electrochemical technology class for the BESS flies in the face of Energy Institute Guidance Battery Storage Guidance Note 1: Battery Storage Planning 2.3 pg. 9 stating that 'the specific chemistry of the battery is important for the planning process because the chemicals released in...an accident will determine the level and nature of the risk.	NO	The Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] confirms that batteries selected for use on the Scheme will be from UK tier 1 manufacturers and will utilise lithium-ion chemistry. Each battery being procured and installed will be fully sealed by design and has no free electrolyte. The lithium-ion batteries will be either NMC (Nickel Manganese Cobalt) or Lithium Iron Phosphate (LiFePO₄) chemistry. The design of the Scheme is an iterative process, and it is common for matters reserved for detailed design to be agreed later in the process. A number of the design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. At this stage, the procurement for the BESS has not been completed. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation sufficient to enable meaningful consultation. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe and therefore has prepared an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (Outline BFSMP) [EN010106/APP/7.6] in consultation with the Health and Safety Executive and Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services (who are also representing Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) to address the issue of battery safety. The Outline BFSMP sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed BFSMP based on the Outline BFSMP is proposed to be a requirement of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Safety is of paramount importance to us and should be fully covered in your consultation material. There is a very real risk of a major catastrophe.	NO	The Applicant assessed the risk of major accidents and disasters in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The assessment concluded that the risk of major accidents and disasters occurring is low for the Scheme and significant effects on the environment, in the unlikely event major accidents or disasters were to occur, are not anticipated. The Applicant has however taken account of good industry practice and where necessary has proposed mitigation measures set out in Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16C of the ES), the Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16F of the ES), and the Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16E of the ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2]] to minimise the risk of any major accidents. With reference to the BESS, the Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Sunnica should be held 100% accountable for this project and any adverse results that affect the countryside and its inhabitants.	NO	The Applicant notes this comment and as the developer of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm acknowledges that it has legal obligations to meet in terms of assessing and monitoring the environmental impact and safety of its proposed scheme. The Applicant has carried out an environmental impact assessment, the results of which are presented in the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Requirements included in Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order submitted with the Scheme are the means by which the Scheme's impacts are controlled or monitored, and those requirements are enforceable (once the DCO is made) through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Can you please explain what the responsibilities are of the landowners in relation to the release of their land to Sunnica and their liabilities to the community in the event of an industrial accident?	No	The responsibility for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed Scheme, and compliance with the requirements within the Development Consent Order in this respect, lies with the person with the benefit of the Order, rather than the landowners. The provisions of the Development Consent Order are enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The project will be covered by a suitable insurance policy. It is not possible to disclose details of individual agreements with landowners as these are confidential.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Who would ultimately be responsible should an incident occur?	No	The person with the benefit of the Development Consent Order would be responsible for the Sunnica Energy Farm during construction, operations and decommissioning in the event that the project receives development consent.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	There are so many dangers to the project and there will be blood on your hands when this goes wrong.	NO	The Applicant notes this comment and as the developer of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm acknowledges that it has legal obligations to meet in terms of assessing and monitoring the environmental impact and safety of its proposed scheme. The Applicant has carried out an environmental impact assessment, the results of which are presented in the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant believes the necessary controls are secured via the proposed Development Consent Order (or other consents) to ensure the safe construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Worlington is situated between 2 BESS sites, E33 and E18. Area E18 is within half a mile of 2 primary schools each with a capacity of 420 children and the development of Red Lodge itself with a population of 6002 (2018).		We assume this comment relates to safety concerns from the BESS for the nearby development. There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Industrial power plants should not be situated anywhere near schools or residential developments, yet Sunnica plan to place these just 120 yards from a school.		There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	One of the battery plants is situated within a few 100m of a school.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Why do Sunnica fail to acknowledge the risk they would be imposing on innocent children? Why do they feel this is acceptable?	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	it is unacceptable that people can be guinea pigs having 500MW of these large battery storage units so close to villages.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	If this project is to go ahead then the location for the BESS needs to be reconsidered to protect residents with respiratory problems.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	During the webinar on 10th Oct Sunnica stated that the battery storage sites were well away from housing (despite there being a farm less than 700 m away from the one near Isleham). And they said they were a "safe distance" from residential areas. But when they were asked what actually constituted a "safe distance" from properties, they did not know the answer.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population. That assessment has been undertaken assuming the “worst case” in terms of distance between residential properties and the BESS that would be allowed pursuant to the restrictions proposed in the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	You claim in your brochure 'after mitigation, it is anticipated that there will be no significant major accidents and disasters from the scheme.' How do you know this? What are the plans for a disaster?	NO	The Applicant assessed the risk of major accidents and disasters in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Given the nature of accidents and disasters, there is the potential for significant effects if an event does occur, however, the assessment has concluded that the risk of such events occurring is low for the Scheme and significant effects on the environment are therefore not anticipated. The focus is on prevention of major accidents and disasters, and mitigation if an event does occur. Taking into account the good industry practice and additional mitigation measures discussed above, the risk of accidents and disasters is considered low. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The plans are causing huge stress locally.	NO	It is not the Applicant's intention to cause undue stress on residents, and we have endeavoured to engage with the local community and provide information in a way that does not create stress in connection with the proposed Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	East Site A will destroy the mental health of people who access the open space and enjoy wildlife and regularly walk along the West Row side of the River Lark.	NO	Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRow, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment have been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. During construction, recreational users of the River Lark will experience major adverse (significant) effects from the presence of construction machinery and associated activities. Following construction and 1 year into operation, recreational users of the River Lark will experience moderate adverse (significant) effects from the presence of the new infrastructure. However, once the vegetation planted for screening has matured (by year 15) these effects are anticipated to reduce to no effect. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRow during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRow. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, some PRow will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure 12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects were identified in this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Concerned that removal of open space and landscape will have a negative impact on resident's mental health	NO	Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRow, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment has been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There will be some significant effects on views and landscape setting during construction, operation and decommissioning. Significant effects identified during construction will be due to the presence of construction machinery and construction activities. Following construction, in year 1 of operation, a number of significant effects on views and landscape setting are likely to remain due to the presence of the infrastructure. However, once the vegetation planted for screening has matured (by year 15) these effects are anticipated to reduce to no effect. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRow during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRow. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, some PRow will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects were identified in this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Loss of landscape and outside space will have a negative impact on mental health.	NO	Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRow, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment has been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There will be some significant effects on views and landscape setting during construction, operation and decommissioning. Significant effects identified during construction will be due to the presence of construction machinery and construction activities. Following construction, in year 1 of operation, a number of significant effects on views and landscape setting are likely to remain due to the presence of the infrastructure. However, once the vegetation planted for screening has matured (by year 15) these effects are anticipated to reduce to no effect. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRow during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRow. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, some PRow will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects were identified in this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	This will undoubtedly lead to mental health problems and a large strain on the already pressured NHS.	NO	Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRow, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment has been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There will be some significant effects on views and landscape setting during construction, operation and decommissioning. Significant effects identified during construction will be due to the presence of construction machinery and construction activities. Following construction, in year 1 of operation, a number of significant effects on views and landscape setting are likely to remain due to the presence of the infrastructure. However, once the vegetation planted for screening has matured (by year 15) these effects are anticipated to reduce to no effect. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRow during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRow. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, some PRow will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects were identified in this assessment. The Applicant has conducted construction and operational noise modelling to assess the potential impacts on nearby receptors. Noise impacts from construction and operation are predicted to be not significant. Changes in noise due to construction traffic are predicted to result in a minor adverse effect at worst, which is not significant. The Applicant has included a Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C [EN010106/APP/6.2] and CTMP in Appendix 13C [EN010106/APP/6.2] to manage potential impacts from noise and traffic during construction. During the operational phase some residents on Weirs Drove and Hythe Lane in Burwell, Cambridgeshire may experience some minor adverse effects from noise from the operational Burwell National Grid Substation Extension. Any tonal, impulsive or intermittent acoustic features will be carefully considered and specific noise control and mitigation measures will be included. This includes procuring equipment with lower (than modelled) sound power levels, silencers and/or acoustic barriers on equipment, and dynamic vibration absorbers and acoustic active

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			cancelling for power transformers as necessary. These effects on human health are considered to be not significant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Negative impact on mental and emotional wellbeing of the 'desertification' of the landscape.	NO	The landscape will not undergo 'desertification'. Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRoW, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment has been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There will be some significant effects on views and landscape setting during construction, operation and decommissioning. Significant effects identified during construction will be due to the presence of construction machinery and construction activities. Following construction, in year 1 of operation, a number of significant effects on views and landscape setting are likely to remain due to the presence of the infrastructure. However, once the vegetation planted for screening has matured (by year 15) these effects are anticipated to reduce to no effect. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRoW during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRoW. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, some PRoW will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects were identified in this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of green spaces and accessible countryside for positive mental health and well-being,	NO	Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRow, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment has been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. There will be some significant effects on views and landscape setting during construction, operation and decommissioning. Significant effects identified during construction will be due to the presence of construction machinery and construction activities. Following construction, in year 1 of operation, a number of significant effects on views and landscape setting are likely to remain due to the presence of the infrastructure. However, once the vegetation planted for screening has matured (by year 15) these effects are anticipated to reduce to no effect. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRow during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRow. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, some PRow will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects were identified in this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The impact of noise during construction will cause damage to mental health.	NO	The Applicant has conducted construction and operational noise modelling to assess the potential impacts on nearby receptors. Noise impacts from construction and operation are predicted to be not significant. Changes in noise due to construction traffic are predicted to result in a minor adverse effect at worst, which is not significant. The Applicant has included a Framework CEMP in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] and CTMP in Appendix 13C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] to manage potential impacts from noise and traffic during construction. During the operational phase some residents on Weirs Drove and Hythe Lane in Burwell, Cambridgeshire may experience some minor adverse effects from noise from the operational Burwell National Grid Substation Extension. Any tonal, impulsive or intermittent acoustic features will be carefully considered and specific noise control and mitigation measures will be included. This includes procuring equipment with lower (than modelled) sound power levels, silencers and/or acoustic barriers on equipment, and dynamic vibration absorbers and acoustic active cancelling for power transformers as necessary. These effects on human health are considered to be not significant.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Loss of landscape and outside space will have a negative impact on physical health.	NO	Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRoW, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment has been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRoW during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRoW. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. During construction, some PRoW will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure 12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The Scheme will deprive residents of access to the countryside and outdoor pursuits.	NO	During the operation phase some residents on Weirs Drove and Hythe Lane in Burwell, Cambridgeshire may experience some minor adverse effects from noise from the operational Burwell National Grid Substation Extension. Any tonal, impulsive or intermittent acoustic features will be carefully considered and specific noise control and mitigation measures will be included. This includes procuring equipment with lower (than modelled) sound power levels, silencers and/or acoustic barriers on equipment, and dynamic vibration absorbers and acoustic active cancelling for power transformers as necessary. These effects on human health are considered to be not significant. Vegetation planting has been proposed throughout and around the Scheme as part of the design to enhance the landscape and screen views of the infrastructure. The design has taken the structure of the existing landscape into account. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects on landscape and visual receptors in the vicinity of the Scheme, such as residents, recreational users of PRoW, motorists, etc. The conclusions of this assessment has been presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Scheme will not permanently affect any PRoW during operation. In fact, new permissive routes are being created that will be open to the public to use throughout operation of the Scheme. These will open up access between existing PRoW. The human health assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of these and access to open space, and concluded that this will provide a beneficial effect to human health during operation (not significant). The locations of these permissive routes to be created are shown in Figure 12-6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			During construction, some PRow will need to be closed for up to 3 weeks each. Those that would need to be closed are shown in Figure 12-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]. The effect of this disruption and reduced access on human health has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], and an adverse effect (not significant) was concluded. The interactions of effects (i.e. intra-project cumulative effects) from the impacts on views and traffic increases on the health of local residents and recreational users of footpaths during construction has been assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The effect interaction from landscape, visual and increased traffic has been assessed as not significant during construction. User's access to open spaces has been considered in Chapter 15 Human Health of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Dust and pollution produced during construction could be lethal to those with lung conditions such as COPD and asthma.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the risk of dust and particulate matter impacts during construction in Chapter 14 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects on air quality are anticipated. Mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts during the construction phase have been incorporated into Appendix 16C Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Noise produced during construction will harm residents.	NO	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP. A Framework CEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Noise impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant as is set out in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. .

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Any detriment to public health should stop the Scheme.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on human health, as set out in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant impacts are expected on human health as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	I am concerned about the long-term safety of the Scheme.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on human health, as set out in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant impacts are expected on human health as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	What effects will electrical radiation from the cables have on the area?	NO	All items carrying some form of electrical voltage or current are subject to electric and magnetic fields. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Scheme did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England was consulted at this stage and raised no concerns.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	We are concerned about the potential electromagnetic health effects of underground cabling of this magnitude.	NO	All items carrying some form of electrical voltage or current are subject to electric and magnetic fields. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Scheme did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England was consulted at this stage and raised no concerns.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	I am concerned that the technology used is new and untested at large scale.	NO	The Scheme will utilise tried and tested technology, both in the PV modules and battery energy storage systems (BESS).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Concerned about unknown health problems caused by the battery farm aspects.	NO	The potential hazards to human health from emissions into the air in the event of a battery fire have been considered. An Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment has been provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population. In relation to any concerns on electromagnetic fields generated by electrical equipment, all items carrying some form of electrical voltage or current are subject to electric and magnetic fields. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Scheme did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England was consulted at this stage and raised no concerns. Measures to prevent pollution to ground, water bodies and air during construction, operation and decommissioning are outlined within Appendices 16C Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan, E Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan, and D Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan respectively of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Has substantial testing been done of battery facilities to see if they are safe? Are these results public?	NO	The Battery Energy Storage System is subject to industry regulation. The Applicant will procure components and using construction techniques which comply with all relevant legislation. Components and construction will comply with relevant legislation and the guidance outlined in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6]. If any deviation from industry guidance is proposed during the Scheme, agreement with Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service (CFRS), Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) will be obtained prior to implementation. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	We are concerned about how safe the PRow network will be considering the solar farm infrastructure, especially for children and horse riders.	NO	Security fencing will be established at an early stage during construction to protect the Scheme. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Not all the battery sites seem easily accessible to emergency service responders should this be required. Will the site have its own emergency response vehicles to respond to damage, how often will the battery sites be checked and monitored. More information on this is required	NO	Access roads will be provided throughout the Sites, all of which will be easily accessible for emergency services. An Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan has been submitted with the DCO [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. It is anticipated that there will be up to 17 permanent staff on-site during the operational phase during a single shift, with staff working on a three-shift pattern.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Battery storage technology is dangerous.	NO	There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	How will you temperature control the battery storage units to maintain efficiency and safety from overheating?	NO	The Scheme design includes cooling systems which are designed to regulate temperatures to within safe conditions to minimise the risk of fire. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS will be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to ensuring battery storage units operate efficiently and safely including preventing overheating within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6]. This fully explores the risks associated with fires from BESS equipment and minimises the impact of an incident during construction, operation and decommissioning of the facility. A project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It contains a detailed description of the battery technology including the potential HVAC units associated with each battery storage container.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	No reassurance of consultation with local air bases to establish storage of fuel dumps or other chemical dumps in the vicinity which would add to risk of fire.	NO	The Applicant consulted local stakeholders as part of its statutory consultation, including USAF Lakenheath and USAF Mildenhall. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS would be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation within the Scheme design and has included an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan in its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6] that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. The Scheme will not process or include large scale chemicals.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	There are dangerous chemicals within solar panels such as Cadmium.	NO	The Sunnica Energy Farm will have an Environmental Management Plan in place for the operation and maintenance of the Sunnica Energy Farm. A draft of this plan can be viewed at Appendix 16F Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2] of the Environmental Statement. This will include measures to regulate environmental effects of the operational phase of the Site, including measures to manage the risk from pollution from small leaks and spillages from proposed infrastructure. The Plan will include a regular schedule for visually inspecting the PV modules, ensuring that the structural integrity of the PV modules will be regularly observed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	What is natural separation within a battery storage environment and how will this achieve a safer environment?	NO	Natural separation is the practice of including design measures to contain and restrict the spread of fire using fire-resistant materials, and adequate separation between elements of the BESS. Thermal barriers or adequate fire separation will be provided in accordance with legislative code requirements. The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Further details can be found in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan submitted together with its DCO application [EN010106/APP/7.6]. The outline plan sets out how the Sunnica Energy Farm proposes to mitigate the potential fire risk posed by the BESS.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	The location of reservoirs to these battery storage systems is pivotal to allow for the access to water for cooling to control the possibility of thermal runaway.	NO	Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Further details can be found in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] and Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Battery storage should not be placed near primary schools.		There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Battery storage should not be placed near residential areas.		There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to ensure that the BESS is safe including with reference to acceptable distance to residential properties and schools. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and the Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In Addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Battery storage should be relocated away from Snailwell and Chippenham due to their explosive potential.		There is a potential fire risk associated with certain types of batteries such as lithium ion. The Applicant recognises how important it is to demonstrate that the BESS will be safe. The Applicant has embedded mitigation in relation to acceptable safe distances from residential properties including those located in Snailwell and Chippenham within the Sunnica Energy Farm design and has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The plan will be further developed following detailed design and the preparation, approval and implementation of a detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (which will include an emergency response plan) is a proposed requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010106/APP/3.1]. The DCO requirement also provides that the relevant planning authorities consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service before approving the detailed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. In addition, an Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Assessment Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The assessment has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Will fences be properly maintained so as to prevent wandering children and bored teenagers from entering?	NO	Security fencing will be established at an early stage during construction to protect the Sunnica Energy Farm. The fence will be a 'deer fence', up to 2.5m in height and will prevent children and bored teenagers from entering. Once operational the Sunnica Energy Farm will have a range of security measures in place to ensure safe operations including CCTV, fencing, and operational staff. Further details can be found with the Appendices 16C Framework CEMP and 16F Framework OEMP within the Environmental Statement. A project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It contains a description of the fencing that is being proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	If an accident does occur, how will emergency services safely access any injured persons in remote areas of the sites?	NO	The Sunnica Energy Farm has been designed in such a way that emergency services will be able to access via the designated access points and use the access tracks to access the different areas of the site. The Applicant has continued to develop the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the non-Statutory and further following the Statutory consultation. The evolved project description has been submitted as part of the DCO application. This is available in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It contains a detailed description of the access points and access roads that are being proposed within the Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Metal palisade fencing with spikes on top should be avoided as its rigidity and sharp edges are very dangerous and have safety implications for equestrian riders.	NO	The fencing proposed for the Scheme will consist of a deer fence up to 2.5m high. A description can be found within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Put solar panels on roofs of new homes and businesses instead.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Wind turbines would be preferable to solar as they use less land and are more efficient.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements wind energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Invest in biogas instead as there is no ecological impact.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements biogas within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Wave power has not been explored sufficiently.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements other forms of renewable energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	It is also worth noting that you could power 100 000 homes by putting panels on the roofs of 100 000 houses and we wouldn't have to worry about the environmental degradation threatened by this scheme.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to a number of other, smaller, solar developments but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.3.25). The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Hydro-electric is the best way forward.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements other forms of renewable energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I would prefer nuclear energy.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to other energy developments including nuclear but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraph 3.5.7). Although the generation of electricity by PV modules is not expressly referred to in Energy NPS EN-1, this is because the development of utility scale solar was not feasible at the time that the NPS was published. The development of utility scale solar is now feasible and on this basis we consider the policies set out in the NPS for Energy EN-1 to be relevant. This is consistent with the fact that solar is now expressly considered in the draft suite of energy NPS. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Put windmills at the top of Chalkhill.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements other forms of renewable energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Offshore wind and hydrogen heating have both specific and time bound goals for contribution to the UK energy sector.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements other forms of renewable energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	A similar amount of energy could be produced from anaerobic digester or an electricity from waste scheme.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements other forms of renewable energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The government is focussing on wind technology.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements other forms of renewable energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Does not fulfil and is indeed totally contradictory to Point 9 of the Governments Ten Point Plan - Protecting our natural environment.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units is provided in the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]). No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. Further information is available in Chapter 8: Ecology of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	There is very little mention of solar energy in the newly released energy white paper. This paper is an important consideration, especially as appeal inspectors are already quoting it.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity as set out by national planning and energy policy. The Applicant has submitted a Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] as part of the DCO application which explains the national need for the Scheme and considers the latest government energy white paper published in December 2020. It also considers the draft NPS EN-3 which provides express support for solar schemes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	For a development of this scale, we would expect it to contribute towards the government target of creating or restoring 500,000 hectares of wildlife-rich habitat outside the protected site network as set out in their 25 Year Environment Plan.	NO	The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units is provided in the Outline LEMP (presented in Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The Net Zero Innovation Portfolio sets out a range of investment priorities in ten novel clean air technologies which do not include solar.		The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements other renewable energy generation within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1. This includes playing an important role in diversifying electricity supplies. The diversification of GB's electricity supplies through the commissioning of both solar and wind assets to the NETS, alongside other low-carbon technologies, provides benefits in the functioning of the NETS and ensuring power is available to consumers across the country when it is required, due to its requirement to operate within the stringent operability and control requirements of the Grid Code.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The development was not mentioned in the recent national infrastructure strategy, published by the National Infrastructure Commission and therefore I am struggling to see how this could be classed as a nationally important development.	NO	The Planning Act (2008) sets out thresholds above which certain types of major infrastructure projects are considered to be nationally significant and require development consent from the relevant Secretary of State. As the Scheme has a generating capacity of over 50MW it is classified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I don't feel the Scheme is compliant with the UK's Solar PV strategy.	NO	The Applicant has prepared a Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] to accompany the DCO application and this sets out the Scheme's compliance with the relevant policy framework considered to be important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision. It concludes that the Scheme is overall policy compliant and that the need and benefits of the Scheme outweigh its limited adverse impacts.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The cumulative impact and effects of the Scheme contradict the principles of the Policy Framework.	NO	It is not clear which Policy Framework is being referred to however the Applicant has prepared a Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] to accompany the DCO application and this sets out the Scheme's compliance with relevant policy framework and concludes the need and benefits of the Scheme outweigh its limited adverse impacts. The Applicant has had regard to developments in the surrounding area in its cumulative assessment, which has been undertaken in each of the technical chapters of the ES and summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Appendix 5A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents the shortlist of cumulative schemes that have been considered in the cumulative assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), which makes absolutely no mention of solar as a component of a future renewable energy mix.	NO	National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (NPS EN-3) identifies the national need specifically for renewable energy generation along with generic impact policies for specific renewable energy technologies. At the time of preparing the NPS in 2011 solar was not proven at a large scale. This has since changed and the Applicant considers the need for the Scheme is supported by this policy statement. Further, the government has now published the draft replacement NPS EN-3 which expressly refers to solar development. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] and the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/ 7.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The Overarching Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) does not mention of solar generation as a nationally important future source of electricity generation except to flag the problems caused by intermittency.	NO	The Overarching Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) sets out national policy for energy infrastructure which constitutes an NSIP as defined in the Planning Act 2008. At the time of preparing the NPSs in 2011 solar was not proven at a large scale. However as the Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project by virtue of it generating more than 50MW of electricity the Applicant considers the need for the Scheme is supported by this policy statement. Further, the government has now published the draft replacement NPS EN-3 which expressly refers to solar development. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] and the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/ 7.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The Government's Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1) emphasises the importance of good design, which includes siting and being sensitive to place, as the key means of minimising the harmful impacts of energy infrastructure on the landscape. A bespoke approach, identifying the features of each landscape area should be the starting point, responding to the characteristics of each area. The failure to adopt the principles of embedded design is a major flaw which is exposed by the inadequate nature of the PEIR.	NO	The Scheme is the result of an iterative design development process which addresses the key opportunities and challenges of the Scheme and the context and setting within which it is located. The design team has worked collaboratively to provide an integrated and responsive design which has been informed by stakeholder engagement. The outcome of which is that the Scheme delivers good design, meeting the requirements of the NPS EN-1 in the context of efficiently delivering large scale renewable energy infrastructure whilst incorporating biodiversity, heritage, landscape and access. The Design and Access Statement accompanying the DCO application explains the evolution of the design [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The NPPF considers that renewable energy projects should be part of the Local Plan process, should not cause cumulative landscape or visual effects and that the only acceptable projects which are outside of Local Plan boundaries should be those supported by communities through the neighbourhood planning process. Clearly this proposal satisfies none of these criteria.	NO	The Applicant has prepared a Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] to accompany the DCO application and this sets out the Scheme's compliance with the relevant policy framework considered to be important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision including the NPPF. It is important to note that as the Scheme is an NSIP its primary policy reference are the energy National Policy Statements. The Planning Statement concludes that the Schemes overall policy is compliant and that the need and benefits of the Scheme outweigh its limited adverse impacts.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The Environment Bill which is reaching the final stages of its journey through parliament is seeking a minimum of 10% biodiversity enhancement. I would anticipate that a scheme of this nature should be an exemplar project which is clearly not the case.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. The Applicant's approach to achieving biodiversity net gain of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units is provided in the Outline LEMP (Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	An assessment against the relevant policies set out in the National Policy Statements is not possible on the basis of the information that has been provided for the purposes of the consultation, and the flaws that have been identified within it, including incomplete and erroneous assessment work. No assessment of the level of harm in respect of relevant environmental considerations has been undertaken. It is impossible to say at this stage therefore whether any specific and relevant policies set out in the relevant NPSs indicate that consent should be refused. However, there is a clearly a realistic prospect that they may.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant considers the amount of information published during the statutory consultation was appropriate for the purposes of a preliminary environmental information report. Preliminary environmental assessments which considered the Scheme's potential impact on a range of environmental considerations were undertaken and published within the PEI Report as part of the statutory consultation. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to undertake further assessments prior to submitting the DCO application. These are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP6.1]. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application sets out why the Applicant considers that the Scheme is compliant with policy in the NPSs.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	What if homeowners don't want to have their power connected to Solar Panels? Is it not their choice?	NO	The Scheme will not provide for homeowners to connect into it. The Scheme will instead connect into the UK's national grid.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The energy stored will come from fossil fuels which is not green.	NO	The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information can be found in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	If Sizewell C is built it is not necessary.	NO	The Applicant is of the view that the Sunnica Energy Farm is not an alternative to other energy generation developments including Sizewell C but will compliment them in providing much needed new renewable energy to the national electricity grid. This is supported by the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy EN-1 (paragraphs 3.3.25 and 3.5.7). Within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1], the Applicant has assessed the contribution that solar can make alongside nuclear in meeting the UK's legal commitment to decarbonisation. Given the delivery risks and timing constraints associated with new nuclear development, nuclear power is unlikely to play a significant role in furthering decarbonisation before the 2030s. Solar projects of the kind proposed by the Applicant are viable and able to come forward quickly to support decarbonisation during the 2030s as part of a renewable energy mix with new nuclear power. Further information is provided within the Statement of Need.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	There is no co-ordinated national policy on prioritisation of sites across the UK which have the potential for the provision of low carbon renewable energy. This means that if it is technically possible on a site to create a solar panel farm, wind farm etc., then that site is essentially "up for grabs." The interpretation and execution of relevant tests of these sites are capable of being presented in such a way as to cloud the underlying issues.	NO	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] explains the reasons for why the land selected for the Scheme is suitable for large scale solar generation. This is supported by Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides a detailed assessment and consideration of alternative sites for the Scheme with reference to planning and environmental constraints of the land and operational requirements of the Scheme including the reasons for the area of search identified. The National Policy Statements for Energy do not identify specific sites for power generation, except in respect of Nuclear – it is for the Applicant to determine which sites are appropriate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	There is economic harm in relying on fossil fuels	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The 'headline' rated power is given as 500MW but this is a mid-summer maximum in sunny weather, and a more relevant figure is the projected annual total energy generated. This is stated in the PEIR as varying between 653,973 MWh in Year 1 to 527,408 MWh in Year 40, allowing for a modest decline in efficiency over time. Taking a simple average over a 40-year operation this gives a typical energy output of 591 GWh per annum. Dividing by the number of hours in a year (8766 hours) gives an annual average power output of about 67MW which is very different from the claimed rated power of 500MW.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the calculations given as they rely on the assumption that the Scheme would be exporting electricity continuously during operations. As the Scheme would only generate electricity during times of sufficient irradiation, these calculations are incorrect. The installed capacity of the scheme will be optimised to the grid connection capacity and the land available for solar development at the point of final design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	You could grow maize instead.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	It may be acceptable to use a 'Rochdale envelope' in uninhabited areas, post-industrial sites or out at sea, but this area is none of the above.	NO	The Planning Inspectorate explains the use of the Rochdale Envelope approach under the Planning Act (2008) in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 9, which has been followed in the Environmental Impact Assessment. The Rochdale Envelope is entirely appropriate for the assessment of this Scheme and there is no policy which states that such an approach is only suitable for certain sites. The Rochdale Envelope assesses the worst case in terms of parameters within the Scheme that will affect human and environmental receptors. It is used to provide flexibility in design options where details of the whole project are not available when the application is submitted, while ensuring the impacts of the final development are fully assessed during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). It sets worst case parameters for the purpose of the assessment but does not constrain the Scheme from being built in a manner that would lead to lower environmental impacts. The draft DCO secures the likely worst case parameters, providing certainty that the impacts of the Scheme will be no worse than those assessed as part of this environmental assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	At present the LPA has no mechanism for determining the point at which a landscape has reached capacity for solar farm infrastructure and can absorb no more without serious adverse impact. Your proposal compounds this vulnerability as it will be managed and determined by the Planning Inspectorate.	NO	The Scheme has been designed in consultation with stakeholders including the Local Planning Authorities. The Local Planning Authorities will have an opportunity to prepare a local impact report which the Secretary of State will have a statutory duty to consider when determining the application for development consent. Therefore, any specific knowledge that the local planning authorities have in terms of the local landscape can be explained by them and will be considered in the decision-making process by the Secretary of State. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application sets out how the national need for the Scheme outweighs any adverse impacts on the local environment including local landscape and how the Scheme is acceptable in planning terms.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I can imagine no other crop that would be planted once and then yield a harvest for 25 years with little maintenance or harvesting cost.	NO	This comment is noted. However, please note that the lifetime of the Scheme is 40 years rather than 25 years.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I hope you can build as many of these as possible across the world.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I believe passionately that we should be finding sustainable solutions wherever possible.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I can't believe people are against this scheme.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I think it's a good plan and if building works are planned with minimal disruption, I have no issues with the solar farm.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	My question to Sunnica was, what % will be exported. The reply of the 12th Nov states, "The Sunnica energy farm will generate income by selling the electricity that it generates on to the national grid. Therefore, we will look to export the maximum amount of electricity generated. It makes no sense to export when the country says it needs green energy to survive and at the same time the scheme would see almost 2,800 acres of food producing land decimated.	NO	In the statement, the Applicant refers to the exporting of electricity generated by the Sunnica Energy Farm into the National Grid transmission system. The Applicant will not export electricity directly outside of the National Grid transmission system. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	There have been a number of local reports that the financial viability of this project is dependent on the inclusion of BESS energy storage capacity allowing the operator to speculate on the open energy market and buy, store and sell power from both the grid and the planned local generating capacity at advantageous pricing. Price manipulation of this sort seems primarily to benefit developers and operators rather than consumers. Is the site viable without this element being present?	NO	The Applicant is proposing a Scheme that is viable without the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). The BESS compliments solar development as solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it Co-locating BESS with PV modules brings additional operational benefits which the Applicant has outlined in Table 10-1 of the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The generation and storage of new forms of energy should be undertaken in ways which enhance our environment rather than destroy it.	NO	Chapter 18 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] includes a summary of all the residual effects identified through the EIA. Each of these effects are discussed in detail in the relevant technical chapters 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is committed to achieving a biodiversity net gain through the Scheme, and it is considered that the substantial areas of native tree, hedgerow and grassland planting will provide enhancements to the local ecological environment. Further information can be found in the ecology assessment in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] which makes it clear that there is not expected to be any likely significant effects on ecological receptors during construction or operation..

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	There is currently no government policy that regulates what is acceptable at a strategic policy level for this type of green energy proposal. It is totally bewildering that a completely unknown entity, with no track record, can come along and offer financial incentives to farmers in exchange for prime agricultural land without there being an overarching policy to govern how and where developers can position such power facilities.	NO	The Sunnica Energy Farm has considered all relevant government policy and guidance in compiling its application for a Development Consent Order. Details of the relevant policy and guidance is reported within the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. The key policy driver for NSIPs is the energy national policy statements which are considered in detail in the Planning Statement The Applicant considers that overall that the Scheme is compliant with these national policy statements.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The UK needs renewable energy infrastructure.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Renewable energy is the future.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	There will be a potential increase in additional energy costs to fund the project and its shareholders.	NO	The Applicant believes that the Scheme will reduce electricity costs to UK consumers rather than increasing them. Solar power reduces the market price of electricity by displacing more expensive forms of generation from the cost stack. This delivers benefits for electricity consumers. Additionally, the Scheme will be delivered without subsidy, meaning costs for its delivery will not be passed onto consumers through their bills. Further information is presented in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Renewable energy generation increases household bills.	NO	The Applicant believes that the Scheme will reduce electricity costs to UK consumers rather than increasing them. Solar power reduces the market price of electricity by displacing more expensive forms of generation from the cost stack. This delivers benefits for electricity consumers. Additionally, the Scheme will be delivered without subsidy, meaning costs for its delivery will not be passed onto consumers through their bills. Further information is presented in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	This site is a 'greenwash' - a battery storage facility with solar PV to give it green credentials.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The predominant element of the Scheme is the PV modules. The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Would combining photovoltaic production with agriculture (agrivoltaics) make the project more palatable to the locals? I am aware that the electrical output of an agrivoltaic system is slightly lower than a purely PV system, but agrivoltaics deliver other benefits.	NO	It is possible to use land within a solar farm for the dual purposes of electricity generation and agriculture. It is the Applicant's intention to allow sheep grazing on the land where the PV modules will be located during the project's operational lifetime. It is likely that the vegetation will be maintained through a mixture of mowing and grazing. Details on the management of vegetation throughout the Scheme are provided in Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Solar energy generation is inefficient	NO	Due to advances in technology, the power generated by solar plants is already at, or below, grid parity cost in the Great Britain. For this reason, solar is economically attractive against other forms of traditional and renewable energy generation in the UK. Solar projects of the scale proposed by the Applicant are able to deliver large amounts of renewable electricity during the 2020s to meet the UK's legal requirement to decarbonise. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Solar energy is a short-term solution and only useful at noon when no-one needs it. What about cloudy days and night?	NO	The Applicant considers solar energy to be an important part of the national energy mix on the path to Net Zero 2050. Solar is not a short-term solution and is expected to form part of the UK's energy mix for the foreseeable future. The Applicant acknowledges that solar energy generation is, by its nature, intermittent and this is built into the case for the Scheme set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. This intermittency is addressed through the integration of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) within the Scheme. The BESS plays an important role in balancing supply and demand, storing and releasing energy during times of varying demand. This allows the Scheme to provide full support to the UK's decarbonisation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The water requirements are huge 1.5 billion gallons and the toxicity of the materials used in the manufacturing process means that our land will be poisoned for decades if not centuries to come.	NO	The Scheme does not have a water requirement of 1.5 billion gallons. During construction, the contractor must follow pollution prevention measures set out in the CEMP and best practice measures. A Framework CEMP has been submitted with the DCO Application and is provided in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. During operation, the equipment will be regularly monitored and maintained to ensure that the risk of leakage of potential pollutants would be reduced as far as possible. This will be undertaken in accordance with an OEMP, a framework version of which is provided in Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The design of the Scheme removes the risk of contamination and pollution from equipment in the Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) through the inclusion of concrete foundations and drainage lagoons. For these reasons, no contamination is anticipated during operations.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Solar panels degrade each year and so inevitably become less efficient. Over a period of 30-40 years of operating life, they will produce a small fraction of the original output.	NO	The Applicant agrees with this assessment, PV modules do indeed degrade every year by an estimated 0.5% resulting in a lower level of production over a period of 30 - 40 years. Assuming that the 0.5% figure is accurate, the Scheme will be producing at 80% of its original operating efficiency by the end of its 40 year operating life. This is not a small fraction. During the Scheme's operating life, the operator may replace PV modules where degradation is such that they are no longer viable. However, the Applicant has assessed this level of degradation and continues to consider that the project is economically viable.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The Sunnica Energy Farm must forge a new paradigm within the energy industry - of low environmental impact.	NO	The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial, significant impact on global climate, due to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions because of the renewable nature of the Scheme. The Scheme has incorporated the principles of biodiversity net gain. This will be enshrined through measures outlined in Appendix 10I Outline LEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2] (submitted as part of the Environmental Statement). No significant residual effects on ecology are predicted during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme's lifetime. A variety of measures are embedded within the Scheme proposals to improve the existing habitat for species already present in the area. We are aiming to improve habitats to increase the range of species already present and to increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area. This will help integrate the Scheme within the context of the existing landscape and prevent and reduce any adverse effects on the ecology of the site. A variety of habitats have been included within the Scheme design as embedded mitigation to further increase the biodiversity and species richness of the area.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The technology will be superseded in a few years leaving a massive white elephant blighting our countryside and costly operation for the entire country.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Solar is not a 'white elephant' and is expected to form part of the UK's energy mix for the foreseeable future. Due to advances in technology, the power generated by solar plants is already at, or below, grid parity cost in the Great Britain. For this reason, solar is economically attractive against other forms of traditional and renewable energy generation in the UK. Solar projects of the scale proposed by the Applicant are able to deliver large amounts of renewable electricity to meet the UK's legal requirement to decarbonise. As such, solar projects are expected to play an important role in the UK's renewable energy mix. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Solar energy is economically damaging to the nation because it is unreliable and is susceptible to power cuts.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. Solar energy is not economically damaging to the nation. It has proven to be a very reliable source of energy and is no more susceptible to power cuts than any other generation technology. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. It is noted that PV modules are an intermittent renewable generation technology. However, it is being designed to be co-located alongside BESS. The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application,

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Solar energy is economically damaging to the nation as it is more costly to generate than other energy sources.		The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. Solar energy is not economically damaging to the nation. It has proven to be a very reliable source of energy and has a lower levelised cost of energy than almost any other renewable generation technology. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Make large scale renewable power generation an urgent priority.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	If allowed to proceed the technology would rapidly become outdated and overtaken by hydrogen and an expansion of offshore wind farms.		Solar is not a short-term solution and is expected to form part of the UK's energy mix for the foreseeable future. Due to advances in technology, the power generated by solar plants is already at, or below, grid parity cost in the Great Britain. For this reason, solar is economically attractive against other forms of traditional and renewable energy generation in the UK. Solar projects of the scale proposed by the Applicant are able to deliver large amounts of renewable electricity during the 2020s to meet the UK's legal requirement to decarbonise. The Applicant acknowledges that solar energy generation is, by its nature, intermittent and this is built into the case for the Scheme set out within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. This intermittency is addressed through the integration of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with the Scheme. The BESS plays an important role in balancing supply and demand, storing and releasing energy during times of varying demand. This allows the Scheme to provide full support to the UK's decarbonisation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The Solar Trade Association states the following in respect to the siting of solar farms: "ground-mounted solar should ideally utilise previously developed land, brownfield, contaminated land and preferably agricultural land of certain classification."		The Applicant supports the work of the Solar Trade Association. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Additionally, the Applicant has sought to use previously developed (brownfield) land, however no brownfield land that meets the minimum individual site size threshold or the area required for a network of sites in close proximity for the whole Scheme has been identified within the search area for the alternatives assessment. Details of this assessment can be found in Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It is also important to note that the Sunnica Energy Farm will not involve the permanent loss of farmland. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of the operational lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during the operational lifetime. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Solar is noted as being an intermittent renewable technology.		The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. It is noted that PV modules are an intermittent renewable generation technology. However, it is being designed to be co-located alongside BESS. The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The sun does not shine all year round in this country so the panels will be useless on days with no sun.		The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. PV module technology relies on light rather than direct sun to function. The light levels result in an overall annual level of production from the PV modules and therefore from the generating station. It is noted that PV modules are an intermittent renewable generation technology. However, it is being designed to be co-located alongside BESS. The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The East of England has significant solar photovoltaic generation in place, with more planned in the future that will make it one of the dominant onshore renewable generation technologies in the short term.		This is noted. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	I am concerned that by relying heavily on renewable energy such as solar and wind power we will be putting ourselves at a serious risk of power outages in the future.		The Applicant notes the concern surrounding the risk of power outages in the future. Solar energy has proven to be a very reliable source of energy and is no more susceptible to power cuts than any other generation technology. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. It is noted that PV modules are an intermittent renewable generation technology. However, it is being designed to be co-located alongside BESS. The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	The UK will be at a competitive disadvantage to other countries that have not committed to using these methods.		The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. Solar energy is not economically damaging to the nation and will not result in the UK being at a competitive disadvantage to other countries that have not committed to using these methods. It has proven to be a very reliable source of energy and has a lower levelised cost of energy than almost any other renewable generation technology. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Renewable energy	Being green requires playing to our strengths in the UK this is wind not solar.		The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant believes that there is a need for different types of renewable energy to come forward and that Sunnica Energy Farm complements wind energy within the national energy mix that in turn promotes energy security. This is also consistent with the existing NPS EN-1.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	Without a carbon footprint for the BESS component, it is impossible for you to state 'carbon savings' for the whole project.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. The BESS components have been included in the lifecycle GHG impact assessment. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. This includes procurement of materials and the impact of construction and decommissioning. During construction, a minor adverse effect on the global climate is anticipated. During operation, the Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. For more information on the assessment methodology, please refer to Section 6.4 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	Are we saving carbon to save face and just pushing the carbon use onto other countries?	NO	Carbon savings through implementation of the Scheme will have a beneficial impact on the global climate. The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Sunnica Energy Farm. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. This included procurement of materials and the impact of construction and decommissioning. During construction, a minor adverse effect on the global climate is anticipated. During operation, the Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. For more information on the scope of the assessment, please refer to Section 6.4 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	Does the footprint calculation include the embedded carbon in the cables, concrete and battery infrastructure; the decommission and recycling of the panels; the replacement food importation; and if included, what are the assumptions used?	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Sunnica Energy Farm. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. This included procurement of materials and the impact of construction and decommissioning. During construction, a minor adverse effect on the global climate is anticipated. During operation, the Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. Land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. However, it is assumed that the new areas of grassland will be returned to cropland following decommissioning of the Scheme. The beneficial GHG impact from land use change is therefore considered to only be temporary (approximately 40 years) and has therefore been excluded from the lifecycle GHG impact assessment presented in Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This is considered to be a robust worst-case approach and likely to underestimate the beneficial effect of the scheme, as it is expected that tree planting will be retained after decommissioning.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			For more information on the assumptions made and the scope of the assessment, please refer to Section 6.3 and Section 6.4 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	The applicant needs to provide a clear report on the fuel consumption and carbon footprint of the scheme after completion showing what was undertaken to reduce fuel consumption and emissions generation.	NO	The contractor will be required to report on fuel consumption and carbon footprint following construction of the Scheme. This will be secured through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). A Framework CEMP is provided in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme, which has included fuel consumption during construction in the calculations. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Scheme to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. The Scheme has embedded mitigation to reduce the GHG impact of the Scheme. Specific measures are outlined in Section 6.7 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the ES [EN/010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. These include measures such as switching off vehicles and plant when not in use, conducting regular planned maintenance on machinery and implementing car sharing and minibus options. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate during operation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	The agricultural land as it stands has a significant positive impact on the environment absorbing CO ₂ and producing oxygen. Nowhere in the Scheme proposals is this environmental impact of the Scheme considered in terms of the net greenhouse gas emission gain or loss per acre of land used.	NO	Land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. However, it is assumed that the new areas of grassland will be returned to cropland following decommissioning of the Scheme. The beneficial GHG impact from land use change is therefore considered to only be temporary (approximately 40 years) and has therefore been excluded from the lifecycle GHG impact assessment presented in Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This is considered to be a robust worst-case approach and likely to underestimate the beneficial effect of the scheme, as it is expected that tree planting will be retained after decommissioning. The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	The green credentials of such a scheme are based on current new technologies and this in itself may necessitate the replacement of panels and batteries early for economic reasons rather than environmental or maintenance.	NO	The Applicant recognises that the term 'green credentials' may be related to the potential benefits and impacts that the Sunnica Energy Farm will have on the environment. During operation, the Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. The replacement of equipment during the lifetime of the Scheme has been accounted for in this assessment. This has been reported on as 'maintenance' in Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Sunnica Energy Farm. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. This included procurement of materials and the impact of construction and decommissioning. During construction, a minor adverse effect on the global climate is anticipated.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	The green energy benefit will be limited once they have imported and mined all the technology needed, imported food and construction and decommissioning impacts	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. This includes procurement of materials and the impact of construction and decommissioning. During construction, a minor adverse effect on the global climate is anticipated. During operation, the Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	Formal carbon lifecycle analysis should be used to prove that during their whole lifecycle this installation will actually save more carbon emissions than it creates. The standard evaluation used is not a complete CLA. Without a robust carbon lifecycle analysis, the development cannot be said to be sustainable.	NO	The lifecycle GHG impact assessment undertaken by the Applicant, as presented in Section 6.8 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], considers all GHG emissions arising over the lifecycle of the Scheme (including construction, operation and decommissioning), and has been carried out in accordance with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance for assessing GHG emissions within Environmental Impact Assessment. The Applicant is of the view that the development can be described as sustainable. The Scheme is answering an urgent national need for forms of low carbon, renewable energy generation. The GHG intensity of the Scheme compares favourably with the projected grid GHG intensity, as well as with alternative energy generation types, and it is estimated that an additional 1,118,041 tCO ₂ e would be emitted to generate the equivalent amount of electricity over the operational lifetime of the Scheme from the projected grid energy mix.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	No information has been given as to the carbon that will be produced to manufacture the concrete, solar panels, metal framework and cabling versus the carbon savings which will result for a scheme which is allegedly only going to provide power for 100,000 homes.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. This includes procurement of materials and the impact of construction and decommissioning. During construction, a minor adverse effect on the global climate is anticipated. During operation, the Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	How much of the carbon saved will be used on importing food to replace what could have grown?	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. The existing baseline in terms of carbon emissions from the Sites is not currently zero. However, to ensure a robust assessment that assesses the worst case, it has been assumed that the existing greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Sites are zero. Some of the crops grown on the agricultural land within the Order limits are currently exported internationally. The conversion of the land from arable crops, which are harvested yearly, to PV modules and native habitat planting (on 30% of the Scheme area) for 40 years, will result in a net saving in carbon dioxide alone, without accounting for the carbon saved through the renewable energy generation. Land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. The amount of carbon used on importing food has not been calculated as it is not necessarily a true assumption that the construction of the Scheme would result in the need to import more food. .

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	How carbon efficient is it to use productive arable land to produce energy?	NO	The Applicant has assessed the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact of the Scheme in Section 6.8 of Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in line with relevant industry guidance. The Scheme has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate. In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Based on our assessments, the majority of the land (96.2%) proposed for use within the Sites is classed as not being 'best and most versatile' and is predominantly grades 3b and 4. The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will rest the land for a period of time and provide a much-needed new source of renewable energy generation. Land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e), largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. However, it is assumed that the new areas of grassland will be returned to cropland following decommissioning of the Scheme. The beneficial GHG impact from land use change is therefore considered to only be temporary (approximately 40 years) and has therefore been excluded from the lifecycle GHG impact assessment presented in Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This is considered to be a robust worst-case approach and likely to underestimate the beneficial effect of the scheme, as it is expected that tree planting will be retained after decommissioning.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	When will this project be net-zero?		This has not been assessed as part of the lifecycle GHG impact assessment. In order to demonstrate GHG emissions savings, which would be needed to calculate when the project would be net zero, we would need to know the direct alternative to the Scheme (i.e. the baseline electricity generation, or what the electricity generated by the Scheme is replacing). While UK grid average projections are available, and have been used to contextualise the emissions from the Scheme, these are not the alternative/baseline for two reasons: - The national grid average assumes considerable uptake of renewable energy projects (such as the Scheme), so therefore already includes 'savings' achieved from such projects. Therefore, it is not a direct comparison as without projects such as the Scheme, grid emissions may not get as low as projected. - As the UK decarbonises, it is unlikely that the grid average represents the direct alternative to the Scheme, or what is being replaced by energy generated by the Scheme. In fact, for effective decarbonisation it is expected that the Scheme will largely replace fossil fuel generation. However it is not possible to know the exact mix, and therefore not possible to model. Instead, the GHG intensity of the Scheme has been compared to the projected grid average and alternative energy generation technologies (see Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]). This Scheme has a key role to play in the decarbonisation of electricity generation and the UK meeting its 2050 net zero target. The Scheme compares favourably to the projected grid average and has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	A diagram showing the GHG emissions boundaries should be included at 6.4.3.		Due to the global nature of climate change and GHG emissions, the Applicant does not consider it appropriate to apply local or regional GHG emissions boundaries, particularly as a great deal of the GHG emissions from the Scheme (for example much of the embodied carbon in construction materials) are anticipated to occur outside any local or regional boundaries. As outlined in Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], the global climate is considered to be the receptor for the lifecycle GHG impact assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	The production of lithium (to produce the batteries for this scheme) produces huge amounts of carbon plus the transportation of it from South America (the biggest producer of lithium) plus thousands of solar panels made of plastic, plus all the pollution produced by the construction of this site and then there is the limited life of all these panels and batteries and the huge amount of pollution caused when it comes to disposing of all this waste.		The Applicant recognises that there will be impacts as well as benefits resulting from the Sunnica Energy Farm. These have been assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant has undertaken a lifecycle greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment of the Sunnica Energy Farm. This identified and assessed GHG emissions arising as a result of the Sunnica Energy Farm to determine the net lifecycle GHG impact. This includes procurement of materials and the impact of construction and decommissioning. During construction, a minor adverse effect on the global climate is anticipated. The Sunnica Energy Farm has been assessed to have a major beneficial effect on the climate during operation. The Applicant's approach to ensuring the benefit of the Sunnica Energy Farm as well as detailed assessments of the Sunnica Energy Farm's climate footprint is discussed within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], in Chapter 6 Climate Change. A Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) is provided in Appendix 16E of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2], which outlines the environmental mitigation measures that would be adopted during decommissioning of the Sunnica Energy Farm. The Waste Hierarchy will be adopted throughout decommissioning, which ensures that the avoidance and reduction in waste production is sought initially. Where it is not possible to avoid waste production, recycling options are explored. The final resort is disposal to landfill.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	How can Sunnica transfer from the Grid the so called "Dirty Energy" (from fossil fuels) into storage and sell it back to the Grid as clean energy? This is a contradiction of what Sunnica are promoting.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Climate Change	If the Scheme was green it would not be at the cost of flora and fauna.	NO	The assessment of Scheme's potential impacts on biodiversity are presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1], which concludes there will be no significant adverse effects on biodiversity. As part of the Scheme, 292Ha of land will be planted with native grassland, wetland, trees and hedgerow habitat. This equates to approximately 30% of the total Scheme area. This does not take into account the areas between PV modules, PV module strings, and under PV modules, which will also be planted with native grassland habitat. The habitat created on site will be managed in accordance with a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. The areas to be planted are shown in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is for the benefit of the developers.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The applicant puts profit before people's safety.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant takes safety concerns very seriously and measures to address safety are embedded throughout the project design. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] with the DCO that has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. This outline plan sets out how the Scheme proposes to mitigate and manage the potential fire risk posed by the BESS. The batteries will be housed within containers. These containers may be modular and joined depending on equipment choice to be determined at detailed design stage. Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally (centralised or decentralised) to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container. Each BESS area requires water storage for use by fire fighters in case of a fire in the BESS compound. Framework management plans for construction, operations and decommissioning have also been elaborated which include safety

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			protocols. These can be found in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP, Appendix 16F Framework OEMP and 16E Framework DEMP all of which can be found as appendices to the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The project team know little about the Scheme they are proposing.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The project team is composed of 'best in class' environmental, land referencing, land agency, consultation and public affairs, legal and technical advisors. The combined effort of the project team has completed the DCO application including the consultation processes and the full suite of relevant documents. All of which demonstrates that the project team know a great deal about the Sunnica Energy Farm that is being proposed. Further information about the Scheme itself can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The promoters of the site have demonstrated a hostile attitude to landowners and threatened the use of compulsory purchase powers to acquire further land.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought to reach voluntary agreements throughout, and compulsory acquisition powers will be used as a last resort. Further details of the communications involved and the approach to compulsory acquisition powers can be found within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Sunnica plan to sell the development once constructed, leaving a big question and concern regarding how the farm will be maintained.	NO	If granted, the DCO would be for the benefit of Sunnica only (except for works in relation to the connection into the substation, for which National Grid would have the benefit), and the DCO would set out the specific circumstances in which the benefit (and the obligations) of the DCO could be transferred to another party. In most cases, the Secretary of State's consent would be required for such a transfer, and in all cases the party to whom the benefit of the DCO is transferred would be bound by the obligations and requirements contained within the DCO. A copy of the Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] can be found within the DCO application documents. The DCO will require that the Scheme is operated and maintained in line with the Operational Environmental Management Plan and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during operation.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is concerning that the applicant has progressed the proposals to the point of triggering the DCO process without being close to being able to demonstrate, even tentatively, that the proposals would be acceptable in planning terms. This suggests a 'proceed regardless' approach which is not evidence led; rather, one where the Scheme is leading the environmental and technical 'evidence'.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application sets out the national need for the Scheme and how the Scheme is acceptable in planning terms.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The company does not have the skillset to develop on the scale proposed.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Sunnica Energy Farm utilises tried and tested technologies and is a joint venture between Tribus Energy and PS Renewables who are experienced developers of solar farms and BESS in the south of England. It is advised by consultants who are 'best in class' environmental, land referencing, land agency, consultation and public affairs, legal and technical specialists.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is a case of corporate greed seeking to achieve maximum profit for shareholders and the companies involved in the project.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	None of the developers live in this area and have made little effort to connect with residents.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has consulted with the full range of both statutory and non-statutory consultees through two rounds of consultation (one informal and one formal). Details of this consultation process including the level of engagement can be found within the Consultation Report (demonstrating compliance with Sections 47-49) [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Consultation Report Appendices [EN010106/APP/5.2] of the DCO application documents. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The developers do not understand the local area and are out of touch.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has consulted with the full range of both statutory and non-statutory consultees through two rounds of consultation (one informal and one formal). Details of this consultation process including the level of engagement can be found within the Consultation Report (demonstrating compliance with Sections 47-49) [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Consultation Report Appendices [EN010106/APP/5.2] of the DCO application documents. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I'm not sure how anyone with a conscience would wish to be part of this project.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It would be appropriate to divulge the cost of the Smith Bros contract and who is financing this prior to receiving planning consent.	NO	The Applicant does not believe that it is appropriate or relevant to enable meaningful statutory consultation to divulge the details of the Smith Brothers contract. Further details regarding the funding of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Sunnica has a negative submission for their last set of accounts, how can a company without a robust financial standing can submit plans to work on an NSIP.	NO	The Applicant has included a Funding Statement as part of the DCO application to demonstrate how the project will be funded. Further details regarding the funding of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is very difficult to find information about Sunnica, hidden in multiple documents in Company's House it is believed to be a Spanish owned company with a huge deficit. They are not very transparent.	NO	Sunnica Limited is registered at Companies House under company number 08826077. The company has submitted all relevant documents as required to date. The Applicant has included a Funding Statement as part of the DCO application to demonstrate how the project will be funded. Further details regarding the funding of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I have been in discussion with your company for some months and I find them arrogant, chaotic and very frustrating to deal with.	NO	The Applicant has engaged with the local community in an open and transparent way and sought to provide information to the community to enable meaningful consultation. The Applicant has consulted with the full range of both statutory and non-statutory consultees through two rounds of consultation (one informal and one formal). Details of this consultation process including the level of engagement can be found within the Consultation Report (demonstrating compliance with Sections 47-49) [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Consultation Report Appendices [EN010106/APP/5.2] of the DCO application documents.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Your company is very shadowy, and it is unclear if it is fit to take on this responsibility. You need to provide much more information on those who are backing you.	NO	Sunnica Limited is registered at Companies House under company number 08826077. The company has submitted all relevant documents as required to date. The Applicant has included a Funding Statement as part of the DCO application to demonstrate how the project will be funded. Further details regarding the funding of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is noted that [member of the project team] and [member of the project team] are listed as involved with a string of companies as a director going back over the last 9 years. In the case of [member of the project team] it is as director of 43 solar companies which include 14 current, 9 dormant, and 20 either dissolved or resigned as a director. As to [member of the project team] the listing is as holding 10 directors appointments with 4 current, 4 dormant and 2 dissolved.	NO	The Applicant does not believe that it is appropriate or relevant to enable meaningful statutory consultation to discuss the Sunnica Limited Directors other current, historical Directorships. Sunnica Limited is registered at Companies House under company number 08826077. The company has submitted all relevant documents as required to date. The Applicant has included a Funding Statement as part of the DCO application to demonstrate how the project will be funded. Further details regarding the funding of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Spanish Director [member of the project team] has a common link with Sunnica Ltd, Jigg Fm Uk Ltd, Padero Solaer Ltd, PSH Operations and eventually to Bosques Solares SL on which no financial information is available. I disagree with the quote in "About Us "that Sunnica Ltd and Tribus Clean Energy Ltd in the joint venture are 2 established companies and PSH Operations Ltd when each was only established within the last 2/3 years. It appears that Sunnica Ltd is just fronting the planning application and is being backed by a large Spanish firm.	NO	Sunnica Limited is registered at Companies House under company number 08826077. The company has submitted all relevant documents as required to date. The Applicant has included a Funding Statement as part of the DCO application to demonstrate how the project will be funded. Further details regarding the funding of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Funding Statement [EN010106/APP/4.2] submitted as part of the DCO application. Sunnica Ltd is a joint venture between two established solar developers, Tribus Energy and PS Renewables. The team bringing forward the Sunnica project are highly experienced in delivering high quality solar and energy storage developments.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Sunnica representatives displayed a certain manner during the public sessions of the first round of consultation which I found hard to fathom and does not bode well for the future of the scheme. When I attended a session to ask what would happen to the red-edged site after a Freckenham landowner pulled out, I was told they would 'see how much they could get on to the rest of the site and then decide whether to compulsorily purchase his land.' On the future of our remaining grassland on Worlington Heath, I was told that it would "still be grassland under the panels". I felt Sunnica representatives were being deliberately intimidatory and that is unacceptable.	NO	It is certainly not the Applicant's intention to be "deliberately intimidatory" and it has sought to engage with the local community in an open and transparent way, and has welcomed the feedback provided from the consultation exercises. The criteria used for site selection was published during the statutory consultation under Chapter 4: Alternatives of the PEI Report and can be found in Appendix 4A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] with the DCO application. Information on how the Applicant has considered alternative sites can be found in the Chapter 4 - Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. The Applicant has revised the design of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report. The Applicant has consulted with the full range of both statutory and non-statutory consultees through two rounds of consultation (one informal and one formal). Details of this consultation process including the level of engagement can be found within the Consultation Report (demonstrating compliance with Sections 47-49) [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Consultation Report Appendices [EN010106/APP/5.2] of the DCO application documents.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Go tell the Russian army.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is against our human rights.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	DCOs should be banned.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is not for the environment - it is for the developers.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application sets out how the national need for the Scheme outweighs any adverse impacts on the local environment and how the Scheme is acceptable in planning terms.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The developers should go and see a mental health doctor.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I bet you live in a city.	NO	The Applicant notes this comment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The only people who will benefit are shareholders of Sunnica.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. Further details regarding the benefits of the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is unethical unhealthy and unclear.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant takes safety concerns very seriously and measures to address safety are embedded throughout the project design. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Framework management plans for construction, operations and decommissioning have also been elaborated which include safety protocols. These can be found in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP, Appendix 16F Framework OEMP and 16E Framework DEMP all of which can be found as appendices to the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has assessed the potential impacts on human health and not found these to be 'unhealthy'. This assessment these can be found within the Chapter 15 - Human Health [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has set out clearly what is being proposed throughout the Sunnica Energy Farm. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant considers that during the statutory consultation it provided sufficient information and presented it in appropriate formats. This included posting a consultation booklet to over 10,000 addresses in Consultation Zone 1 and hosting a number of topic specific webinars where members of the project team detailed the Scheme and answered questions in real time. The consultation booklet and virtual exhibition signposted to the Environmental Statement which contained detailed

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			information on the Applicant's assessments and proposed design. The Applicant has sought to provide detailed, helpful answers to enquiries raised by the community. This included signposting where additional information could be accessed within the PEI Report. The Applicant responded to all enquiries that it received ahead of the statutory consultation closing.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Sending out section 172s to 72-year-old pensioners is inappropriate, insensitive and shows zero respect to locals.	NO	It is not the Applicant's intention to cause undue stress on residents, and we have endeavoured to engage with the local community and provide information in a way that does not create stress in connection with the proposed Scheme. The Applicant has sought to reach voluntary agreements for the purpose of survey work. Further details regarding all of the negotiations relating to the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The situation could be likened to that of a hostile takeover – whereby shareholders would still have the right to refuse the bid. Homeowners in the area are the shareholders in this case and should be given the right to decide what happens in the local area.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has consulted with the full range of both statutory and non-statutory consultees through two rounds of consultation (one informal and one formal). Details of this consultation process including the level of engagement can be found within the Consultation Report (demonstrating compliance with Sections 47-49) [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Consultation Report Appendices [EN010106/APP/5.2] of the DCO application documents. In addition to the Applicant's consultation, the DCO process will require that the proposed Scheme will be subject to an independent examination prior to any planning decision being made. Anyone with an interest in the proposals can register to make representations during the examination. Following the examination, the examining authority will give a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether or not the proposals should be approved. The process therefore provides ample opportunity to public participation, the Applicant does not consider the proposals to represent 'a hostile takeover'.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The ability to harvest and buy power when cheap and then sell back to the nation when short and expensive is far from the public good.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The battery storage element of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm will complement the wider shift towards renewable energy generation. Solar and other forms of renewable energy generation are intermittent by their nature. Battery storage means that electricity can be stored when more is being produced than is needed at a certain time and released again when it is needed. Battery storage also contributes to the stabilisation of the national power grid. At times of an excess or shortfall in demand battery storage facilities can balance the grid by making up for any shortfalls or by removing power and storing it.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I work for a smaller solar company doing the same as you guys so I won't be objecting.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The applicant is manipulating the planning process to bypass local approval process.	NO	The proposed Scheme qualifies as a NSIP because the total project installed generation capacity is proposed to be more than 50MW. As required by the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant has consulted with the local community, as well as local authorities, regulatory bodies and service providers. In preparation for this statutory consultation, the Applicant has worked with a group of officers from West Suffolk Council, Suffolk County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. Our proposals for the consultation are set out in a SoCC which is available to view on the Sunnica website. In addition to the Applicant's consultation, the DCO process will require that the proposed Scheme will be subject to an independent examination prior to any planning decision being made. Anyone with an interest in the proposals can register to make representations during the examination. Following the examination, the examining authority will give a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether or not the proposals should be approved. The process therefore gives significant weight to local views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We fully approve these proposals and have no objections.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Bribing landowners is not appropriate.	NO	The Applicant has not bribed landowners. The Applicant has sought to reach voluntary agreements with landowners throughout the project. Further details regarding these negotiations relating to the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I believe where the development is spread out over a large area and effects many communities like mine, that the wishes of the communities should take precedent over the interests of business.	NO	The Applicant has sought meaningful engagement with the community and has had regard to all feedback received. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Sunnica Energy Farm in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. Further information on the changes made by the Applicant can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report. In addition to the Applicant's consultation, the DCO process will require that the proposed Scheme will be subject to an independent examination prior to any planning decision being made. Anyone with an interest in the proposals can register to make representations during the examination. Following the examination, the examining authority will give a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether or not the proposals should be approved. The process therefore gives significant weight to local views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Grenfell inquiry comes to mind, whereby a contractor knowingly installed hazardous flammable materials, in the hope that such a terrible scenario would never happen, all at the expense of the local inhabitants.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the situation described is comparable to this application. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant takes safety concerns very seriously and measures to address safety are embedded throughout the project design. Further information can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Framework management plans for construction, operation and decommissioning have also been elaborated which include safety protocols. These can be found in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP, Appendix 16F Framework OEMP and 16E Framework DEMP all of which can be found as appendices to the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Where is the justice?	NO	In addition to the Applicant's consultation, the DCO process will require that the proposed Scheme will be subject to an independent examination prior to any planning decision being made. Anyone with an interest in the proposals can register to make representations during the examination. Following the examination, the examining authority will give a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether or not the proposals should be approved. The process therefore gives significant weight to local views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It's obvious they are trying to get the horrendous planning through without using the legal requirements.	NO	In addition to the Applicant's consultation, the DCO process will require that the proposed Scheme will be subject to an independent examination prior to any planning decision being made. Anyone with an interest in the proposals can register to make representations during the examination. Following the examination, the examining authority will give a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether or not the proposals should be approved. The process therefore gives significant weight to local views. There is no intention from the Applicant to circumvent the planning process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I condemn the hypocrisy of some residents with their "No to Sunnica" signs outside their homes festooned with energy-draining, eye-searingly ugly Christmas lights that they inflict on the rest of us for a 12th of the year.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I condemn the general attitude that people support more eco-friendly power, but not on their doorstep thank you.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I would hope and urge the National bodies and decision makers to take heed of our local opinions and concerns.	NO	The Development Consent Order (DCO) process allows for local voices to be heard through the Applicant's own consultation prior to submitting its DCO application and also during examination. This ensures that local voices are heard by the examiners and the Secretary of State when they are considering the Application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	In the last two years vast cabling was laid from Burwell to Lakenheath, can you evidence this was not an underhand way to facilitate this Scheme without consultation?	NO	The underground cabling to which the respondent refers is understood to connect the RAF Lakenheath to the electricity distribution network at Burwell. This is not connected directly to the Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The area near the Burwell Substation has already sprouted a solar farm, to the north of Little Fen Drove. Is there a connection between that development and yours?	NO	The solar farm to the north of Little Fen Drove is not connected to the Sunnica Energy Farm.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Locally we are called carrot crunchers, so how can we eat our carrots if all we have is energy farms	NO	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the relevant policy requirements, the Applicant has sought to minimise the use of agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other		NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I'm sure you have some area where you love to live, so if you can possibly manage it just TRY to think, for a minute or so, just how it would feel to lose it. Go on just TRY.	NO	The Applicant does not believe that it is taking the character of the area away. It has had regard to feedback received during the statutory consultation and is proposing a design that incorporates setbacks from local settlements and planting to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed Scheme. Further information can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report and Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	In view that you are proposing compensation farmers and landowners and very substantive payments to councils I am sure your plans will be sanctioned.	NO	The DCO process will require that the proposed Scheme will be subject to an independent examination prior to any planning decision being made. Anyone with an interest in the proposals can register to make representations during the examination. Following the examination, the examining authority will give a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether or not the proposals should be approved. The process therefore gives significant weight to local views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	All we will gain is complete take over by Sunnica. To obey them. What happened to being listened to, to look from both sides. To listen to the people. Freedom of speech.	NO	The Applicant has sought meaningful engagement with the community and has had regard to all feedback received. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Sunnica Energy Farm in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received. Further information on the changes made by the Applicant can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/6.1]. In addition to the Applicant's consultation, the DCO process will require that the proposed Scheme will be subject to an independent examination prior to any planning decision being made. Anyone with an interest in the proposals can register to make representations during the examination. Following the examination, the examining authority will give a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether or not the proposals should be approved. The process therefore gives significant weight to local views.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	What is the Community Infrastructure Levy likely to be?	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward its proposals as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) which requires that planning consent is obtained through a Development Consent Order (DCO). The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is not payable for developments of this kind of infrastructure.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	West Suffolk councils now support 31 organisations through its solar for business scheme, and this currently generates £125,000 per year to support council services and provides financial and environmental benefits to all involved. Indeed, schemes like this, plus the Toggam Solar Farm 2 miles away from Lakenheath, have made sure that the council has a carbon neutral status. But Sunnica will not provide direct benefits to the local community.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with the assessment that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm does not provide direct benefits to the local community. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The outline plan includes details of employment opportunities during both construction and operations, and sets out proposals that the final version of the plan will contain a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	There is no benefit to the local community.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with the assessment that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm does not provide direct benefits to the local community. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The outline plan includes details of employment opportunities during both construction and operations, and sets out proposals that the final version of the plan will contain a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment The effect on the local community is assessed within Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The applicant should be encouraged to recognise the negative impacts of such significant infrastructure provision upon small rural communities.	NO	The ES comprises a comprehensive assessment of impacts of the Scheme, including identification of potential significant adverse effects so these can be addressed and as far as possible mitigated. Landscape planting to provide screening has been carefully designed throughout the Scheme to minimise the effects on views of the local communities. The landscape and visual impact assessment is included in Section 10.8 of Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An assessment on the effect on the local community is presented in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant's assessment found no potential significant adverse effects on socio-economics and land-use during the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Scheme, apart from temporary significant effects on users of some public rights of way (PRoWs) which will be temporarily closed (for up to three weeks) during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Further details are presented in Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The SPS continues to lobby for an appropriate legacy fund or environmental fund to compensate (in part) those that will undoubtedly be impacted upon and disrupted during the life of this project.	NO	The Applicant notes that the SPS continues to lobby for an appropriate legacy fund or environmental fund. The Applicant disagrees with the assessment that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm does not provide direct benefits to the local community. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The outline plan includes details of employment opportunities during both construction and operations, and sets out proposals that the final version of the plan will contain a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	If the energy generated there was in some small way "shared" with the village then I suspect opposition would be significantly reduced.	NO	The Applicant notes this observation. However, the Sunnica Energy Farm will be connected directly into the transmission network via the National Grid Substation Extension at Burwell and it is currently not technically feasible to directly connect local villages to the energy generated.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	A community benefit package should make good roads and kerbs, supporting mental health services, funding community projects, reimbursing councils for the resources taken up reviewing plans and monitoring the project.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with the assessment that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm does not provide direct benefits to the local community. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The outline plan includes details of employment opportunities during both construction and operations, and sets out proposals that the final version of the plan will contain a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment The benefit to the local community is assessed within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Residents should have free or reduced electricity.	NO	The Applicant notes this observation. However, the Sunnica Energy Farm will be connected directly into the transmission network via the National Grid Substation Extension at Burwell and it is currently not technically feasible to directly connect local villages to the energy generated.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The only benefits on offer are entirely attributed to employment during the 2-year construction period, and possible training - with no guarantees that these will be allocated to local people.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with the assessment that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm does not provide benefits outside of the construction period. The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The Applicant has had regard to feedback received through the statutory consultation which identifies local businesses and opportunities to promote local skills development in developing the Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The most obvious benefit you should contribute is subsidising and otherwise enabling solar generation on homes and businesses in the area.	NO	The Applicant notes this observation. The Applicant is proposing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. In terms of wider benefits, the Applicant is happy to discuss such ideas but they will be outside of the remit of the Applicant's Development Consent Order application and would form part of the Applicant's community engagement were it to receive development consent.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We note that only 5 members of staff would be required on site during normal operational hours. Further to this, and given how solar energy works, we question what long term benefits would be provided for both West Suffolk, and the wider region once the project is complete.	NO	Since statutory consultation, the design has been further developed and during operation, 17 permanent members of staff will be working on site. It is estimated that the Scheme will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (which considered an average study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site). The 29 net additional jobs include the 17 permanent members of staff, plus the wider employment generated within the supply chain (such as deliveries and other suppliers). Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the assessment on the local economy and socio-economic effects. The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Will I be able to receive this solar energy to my property?	NO	The Sunnica Energy Farm will be connected directly into the transmission network via the National Grid Substation Extension at Burwell and it is currently not technically feasible to directly connect local residents to the energy generated. Further information on the design can be found in Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	No thought has been given to residents.	YES	The Applicant does not agree with this assessment. Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has had regard to the feedback received during the statutory consultation and has made changes to the proposed design in response. This includes removing areas from solar development to create greater distance between the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm and local settlements: particularly Worlington and Isleham. Further information can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	This project does not have the consent or support of the local community and that cannot be dismissed.	NO	The Applicant recognises that many local people feel strongly about the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. This has been reflected in the feedback that the Applicant has received through the statutory consultation which the Applicant has had regard to in refining its proposed design. This includes removing areas from solar development to create greater distance between the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm and local settlements: particularly Worlington and Isleham. Further information can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Worlington PC had a survey only 5 out of 140 people were for it.	NO	The result of this survey is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I have not yet seen a single board saying "SAY YES TO SUNNICA". I think you are going to face an uphill struggle in gaining permission for your Suffolk solar farm!	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	What are you planning to do to gain some local support?	NO	The Applicant has had regard for all comments received through the consultation process. The Scheme design is an iterative process, and the Applicant has sought to reflect feedback received from the local community in the submitted application. The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The opposition to the Scheme is clear with villages having Say No to Sunnica signs all over them.	NO	The Applicant recognises that many local people feel strongly about the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. This has been reflected in the feedback that the Applicant has received through the statutory consultation which the Applicant has had regard to in refining its proposed design. This includes removing areas from solar development to create greater distance between the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm and local settlements: particularly Worlington and Isleham. Further information can be found in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I believe that local residents will cause significant damage to the site as feelings are currently running high in the local community, breaking the law where they deem it necessary to safeguard their interests.	NO	The Applicant does not wish to comment on speculation. The Applicant takes the issue of security seriously and has considered this within its proposal. The Applicant will ensure that the Scheme is secure to minimise the potential for damage to occur through criminal activity. This will include fencing, CCTV cameras and lighting in critical areas. Fencing will be established at the earliest stage of construction commencing. These are described in further detail in Chapter 3: Scheme Description [EN010116/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I have been through some tough times in my 70 years, but this is a sword of Damocles over my head and will blight the rest of my life in this area.	NO	It is not the Applicant's intention to cause stress to local people, and we have endeavoured to engage with the local community and provide information in a way that does not create stress in connection with the proposed Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Scheme is a waste of tax-payers money.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm as a private venture and it will not be funded through government subsidies. A Funding Statement has been submitted as part of the DCO application [EN010116/APP/4.2] to demonstrate how the Applicant will fund the Scheme's construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Get the costs down to remove subsidies.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm as a private venture and it will not be funded through government subsidies. A Funding Statement has been submitted as part of the DCO application [EN010116/APP/4.2] to demonstrate how the Applicant will fund the Scheme's construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	What is the total capital cost of the project and how does that compare with roof mounted solar PV on a per kw produced basis?	NO	The Applicant considers that the cost per kWh produced should compare favourably with that produced by roof mounted PV modules owing to the economy of scale that can be achieved. The total capital cost of the Scheme is expected to be approximately £600 million. Further information is provided in the Funding Statement [EN010116/APP/4.2]

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The provision of subsidies to construct such an environmentally and community damaging project in energy generation is questionable.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm as a private venture and will not be funded through government subsidies. A Funding Statement has been submitted as part of the DCO application. [EN010116/APP/4.2] to demonstrate how the Applicant will fund the Scheme's construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The development will inflate electricity costs for customers.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm as a private venture and will not be funded through government subsidies. A Funding Statement has been submitted as part of the DCO application. [EN010116/APP/4.2] to demonstrate how the Applicant will fund the Scheme's construction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The size of the proposed development could cause an artificial microclimate.	NO	Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses the impact of GHG emissions arising as a result of the Scheme on the climate, and provides a review of the resilience of the Scheme to projected future climate change impacts. In line with industry guidance on the scope of Climate Change chapters in EIA, microclimate impacts are not considered within Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], as microclimate impacts are not anticipated as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	No mention is made of the known phenomenon of the photovoltaic heat island effect (G.A. Barron-Gifford et al) in which night-time temperatures have been shown to be 3-4 C higher over and around solar PV installations, relative to similar wildlands in the same area. Although the claimed benefits of Sunnica include a contribution to amelioration of global warming, there will almost certainly be local changes in the microclimate as an immediate consequence.	NO	Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses the impact of GHG emissions arising as a result of the Scheme on the climate and provides a review of the resilience of the Scheme to projected future climate change impacts. In line with industry guidance on the scope of Climate Change chapters in EIA, microclimate impacts are not considered within Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] as microclimate impacts are not anticipated as a result of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Since the Sunnica proposal directly abuts several Nature Reserves and SSSIs, it is a significant omission not to include a detailed evaluation of the PVHI effect, it is likely range, and impact upon the protected SSSIs that are likely to be affected.	NO	Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assesses the impact of GHG emissions arising as a result of the Scheme on the climate and provides a review of the resilience of the Scheme to projected future climate change impacts. In line with industry guidance on the scope of Climate Change chapters in EIA, microclimate impacts are not considered within Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Microclimate impacts are not anticipated as a result of the Scheme. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] provides an assessment of the operational impacts on European Sites and SSSIs.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Sunnica are using the area as an experiment which has no guarantees of a positive outcome.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Sunnica Energy Farm utilises tried and tested technologies and is a joint venture between Tribus Energy and PS Renewables who are experienced developers of solar farms and BESS in the south of England. The Applicant has undertaken an environmental impact assessment while preparing its proposals. This assessed the potential impact of the proposals on a number of environmental topics including: landscape and visual amenity, noise, transport and climate change. Where these assessments have identified significant effects, the Applicant is proposing mitigation. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed by the Applicant can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The community has undertaken work to improve the area which will be dismantled by the project.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant does not believe that it is harming the character of the area. It has had regard to feedback received during the statutory consultation and is proposing a design that incorporates setbacks from local settlements and planting to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed Scheme. Further information can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report and Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	How many times are residents going to be cut off while you do all connections?	NO	The Sunnica Energy Farm has been assessed to have no effect on utilities. Appendix 16C Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010116/APP/6.2] submitted as part of the DCO application will include mitigation measures to reduce the risk of damaging utilities during construction. The DCO also includes protective provisions that the Applicant has negotiated with utility providers in order to ensure the protection of their assets. The Applicant is committed to being a responsible neighbour to those living near the Sunnica Energy Farm and will continue to engage with the local community should consent be granted. This includes regular updates through a dedicated website, social media page and on-site display board. Further information can be found in Appendix 16C: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	There will be a great amount of upheaval for farmers and landowners allowing their land to be taken over or used with little profit in these hard times!	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The impacts on the local community have been assessed within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN010116/APP/6.1]. The assessment has not shown that there will be a great amount of upheaval for farmers and landowners allowing their land to be taken over or used with little profit.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	This development will remove a lot of rural freedoms for the local villagers.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant's assessments have found no potential significant adverse effects on socio-economics and land-use during the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of the Scheme, apart from temporary significant effects on users of some public rights of way (PROWs) which will be temporarily closed (for up to three weeks each) during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. All temporary PROW closures will be avoided as far as possible including along the cable route; however, as a worst case scenario it is assumed that each PROW will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction and decommissioning phase. The potential effect on PROW closures range from Moderate adverse to a Negligible adverse effect. The temporary closures will be supported by appropriate and clearly signed alternative routes and where possible will be planned and programmed to minimise disruption to users. Further details can be found in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) in Appendices 16C and 16E of the Environmental Statement respectively [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	You are evicting households through compulsory purchase.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought to reach voluntary agreements with landowners throughout the project. Further details regarding these negotiations relating to the Sunnica Energy Farm can be found within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1]. The Applicant has no plans to evict any household through compulsory purchase.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Residents will see their quality of life diminished.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The impacts on the local community have been assessed within Section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES [EN010116/APP/6.1]. The assessment has not shown that the residents will see their quality of life diminished.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Residents will move away in case it gets approval.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The impacts on the local community have been assessed within Section 12.8 Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN010116/APP/6.1]. The assessment has not shown that the residents will move away in case the Sunnica Energy Farm gets approval.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I am against the lack of respect being shown to the community around the area.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. The Applicant has sought meaningful engagement with the community and has had regard to all feedback received. The Applicant has sought to minimise impact on residents and has made significant amendments to the Scheme in response to both the non-statutory and statutory consultations to reflect feedback received as set out in Chapter 2 and Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010116/APP/5.1]. The Scheme does not include the provision of educational and/or visitor facilities; however it is possible that training and educational activities will form part of the Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan which will be developed for the Scheme in due course. Further information is set out in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010116/APP/7.8] submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The PEIR states that the Scheme is unlikely to interfere with telecommunications and television reception but does not explain how this conclusion has been reached.	NO	The mobile telecommunications masts will not be affected by the Scheme, given the low-lying nature of the Scheme and the lack of potential for it to form a barrier between the mast and any receiving station. Therefore, the Scheme is not anticipated to interfere with telecommunications infrastructure and no effects are anticipated in the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The Scheme consists of fixed low-lying infrastructure with no moving parts and is therefore unlikely to interfere with digital television signals and therefore no effects are anticipated in the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. This is discussed in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Telecommunications, television reception and utilities have not been discussed in the same level of detail as the environmental topics presented in Chapters 6 to 15 of the Environmental Statement due to the unlikely impact associated with the Scheme and typical solar farms. This was confirmed by the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Can you please expand on the section on telecoms on p29 when it states 'the only potential impact from the Scheme is on existing utilities during construction'? What is an existing utility and what impacts are envisaged?	NO	On-site utilities could include water, sewers, gas or oil pipelines and electrical cables. The potential exists for utilities to be affected during construction through damage caused as a result of excavation and engineering operations. However, during operation, no excavation or other intrusive works would be undertaken, and so there would be no potential effects on the existing utilities within the Scheme. The Applicant has also negotiated protective provisions in the DCO with utility undertakers to ensure measures are in place for the protection of their assets. During decommissioning, works would be undertaken within the footprint excavated during construction, so no adverse effects to existing utilities through decommissioning activities are expected.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The scheme will provide jobs and clean energy to the area.	NO	This is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We are concerned about impact on local employment from the development which will replace numerous farming & quarrying jobs in the community with a minimum employment level after construction.	NO	The Applicant has assessed that there will be no net employment loss as a result of the Scheme. There may be some temporary jobs which will not be offered, which is estimated to be two temporary jobs related to agricultural activities (considered equivalent to one permanent job). See Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] for further information. Since statutory consultation, the design has been further developed and during operation, 17 permanent members of staff will be working on site. It is estimated that the Scheme will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (which considered an average study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site) to the site). The 29 net additional jobs include the 17 permanent members of staff, plus the wider employment generated within the supply chain (such as deliveries and other suppliers). Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the assessment on the local economy and socio-economic effects. The Applicant has identified a number of skills and employment opportunities within the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. These opportunities include measures to recruit locally and to promote science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education among young people in the area.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The size and specialised nature of the proposal will surely exclude all but the very minimal local business involvement.	NO	The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Sunnica Energy Farm and will source locally where possible. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This identifies a number of opportunities to promote local business involvement in the Scheme, including through building relationships with local business groups and by adopting a procurement strategy that maximises purchasing from local businesses.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	I am a Governor at Mildenhall College Academy with Careers as a part of my portfolio. I am also a part of the New Anglia LEP Enterprise Adviser Network with responsibility for providing enterprise advice and support to local schools. We would value any opportunities to promote job opportunities to local young people and would encourage you to provide careers education and information about careers in the renewable energy sector to local schools.	NO	The Applicant has identified a number of skills and employment opportunities within the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. These opportunities include measures to recruit locally and to promote science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education among young people in the area.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We are disappointed not to see key employment figures which again would help us judge the economic benefits of the proposed project.	NO	The socio-economics assessment that has been produced for the Environmental Statement (presented in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010106/APP6.1]) estimates that construction will generate 1,685 net additional jobs per annum, of which 1,483 are likely to be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (i.e. study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site) to the site). Since statutory consultation, the design has been further developed and during operation, 17 permanent members of staff will be working on site. It is estimated that the Scheme will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (which considered an average study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site). The 29 net additional jobs include the 17 permanent members of staff, plus the wider employment generated within the supply chain (such as deliveries and other suppliers). Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the assessment on the local economy and socio-economic effects. The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Sunnica Energy Farm and will source locally where possible. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This identifies a number of opportunities to promote local business involvement in the Scheme, including through building relationships with local business groups and by adopting a procurement strategy that maximises purchasing from local businesses.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We see that the project would require, 1,260 members of staff during the peak of construction but it is not clear how many of these roles would be new jobs or people who were already employed.	NO	The socio-economics assessment that has been produced for the Environmental Statement (presented in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010106/APP6.1]) estimates that construction will generate 1,685 net additional jobs per annum, of which 1,483 are likely to be within study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site) to the site. Since statutory consultation, the design has been further developed and during operation, 17 permanent members of staff will be working on site. It is estimated that the Scheme will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (which considered an average study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site) to the site). The 29 net additional jobs include the 17 permanent members of staff, plus the wider employment generated within the supply chain (such as deliveries and other suppliers). Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the assessment on the local economy and socio-economic effects. Further information can be found in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN010106/APP6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	On a project of this size, we would expect to see significant social value opportunities for apprenticeships/work experience for young people in the area, and there is little information on this.	NO	The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The creation of jobs has been assessed within the operational employment section of the Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The project should utilise local young people such as from West Suffolk College to help with the project and in turn upskill and provide work and training opportunities.	NO	The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The benefit to the local community is assessed within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	We would hope the project would utilise local businesses and supply-chains who could help provide the project with necessary resources, goods, and services, helping to retain spending in our county.	NO	The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan, the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	There will be a loss of jobs in farming and associated industries.	NO	The existing Order limits is agricultural land, and there is expected to be no employment loss as a result of the Scheme; however, there may be some temporary farming jobs which will no longer be offered. This has been estimated to be close to two jobs related to agricultural activities based on information provided by the landowners to the Applicant. Considering these are not permanent jobs which are being lost, the 'deadweight' employment has been assessed as one permanent job will be lost. 'Deadweight' refers to outcomes which would have occurred without intervention such as if the Scheme were to result in a disruption to any existing economic activity currently occurring in relation to the Order limits. See Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] for further information. Further information is available in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Will local contractors and sub-contractors be used where possible?	NO	The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	For a project of this scale, during the construction phase, a minimum of 50% of employees should be sourced from within 10 miles of the site and the site operators should live within 5 miles of such a facility.	M	The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Sunnica Energy Farm and will source locally where possible; this would be delivered via the Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan, the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The applicant has had regard to feedback received through the statutory consultation which identifies local businesses and opportunities to promote local skills development. It is estimated that construction will generate 1,685 net additional jobs per annum, of which 1,483 are likely to be within study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site). Since statutory consultation, the design has been further developed and during operation, 17 permanent members of staff will be working on site. It is estimated that the Scheme will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (which considered an average study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site). The 29 net additional jobs include the 17 permanent members of staff, plus the wider employment generated within the supply chain (such as deliveries and other suppliers). Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the assessment on the local economy and socio-economic effects. The Applicant is committed to providing a legacy of community benefits through the Scheme. The Applicant is providing a dedicated skills programme to identify opportunities for individuals to access employment. Further information can be found in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
			implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	According to the model for the ongoing management of the sites, there will only be very few employees in the longer term.	NO	The Applicant has assessed that the Sunnica Energy Farm will generate a series of long-term jobs once it is complete and operational. Since statutory consultation, the design has been further developed and during operation, 17 permanent members of staff will be working on site. It is estimated that the Scheme will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (which considered an average study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site). The 29 net additional jobs include the 17 permanent members of staff, plus the wider employment generated within the supply chain (such as deliveries and other suppliers). Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the assessment on the local economy and socio-economic effects. These estimates are detailed in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is committed to providing a legacy of community benefits through the Scheme. This includes a dedicated skills programme designed to provide local people with opportunities to work on an operational solar and battery storage installation. The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Scheme and will source locally where possible. Further information is available in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It will not create local jobs.	NO	The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on employment locally. The results of this assessment are set out in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. It is estimated that construction will generate 1,685 net additional jobs per annum, of which 1,483 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (45 minute travel time to the site). Since statutory consultation, the design has been further developed and during operation, 17 permanent members of staff will be working on site. It is estimated that the Scheme will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within the study area for the socio-economics assessment (which considered an average 45 minute travel time to the site). The 29 net additional jobs include the 17 permanent members of staff, plus the wider employment generated within the supply chain (such as deliveries and other suppliers). Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] sets out the assessment on the local economy and socio-economic effects. The Applicant is committed to providing a legacy of community benefits through the Scheme. This includes a dedicated skills programme designed to provide local people with opportunities to work on an operational solar and battery storage installation. The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Scheme and will source locally where possible. The Applicant has had regard to feedback received through the statutory consultation which identifies local businesses and opportunities to promote local skills development. Further information is available in the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is disgraceful the local people are against it – purely a case of NIMBY.	NO	This comment is noted.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Ban all consent orders.	NO	The Applicant disagrees with this assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Concerned about mining of rare-earth materials for construction which is ecologically damaging and exploits workers.	NO	The Applicant recognises that there are risks connected to UK businesses and supply chains and will comply with all legal obligations regarding modern slavery.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Concerned about low-wage manufacturing of the solar panels.	NO	The Applicant recognises that there are risks of modern slavery being connected to UK businesses and supply chains and will comply with all legal obligations regarding modern slavery.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The installations will be made with imported equipment which undermines UK industry and makes us dependent on foreign manufacturers/ overseas governments for maintenance.	NO	The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. It is true that the bulk of expertise in the manufacture of solar equipment exists outside of the UK, this does not undermine UK industry as the UK is not a specialist in this field. The delivery of large scale solar projects in the UK has the potential to increase the UK's expertise in this area and to enable the future local manufacture of equipment in the UK. Where possible, the Applicant will seek to make use of local staff and suppliers during operations. Further information is provided within the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8].

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Sunnica have indicated they expect that essentially all the panels and batteries will come from China because there is insufficient technology and manufacturing in the UK. Since the UK wants to be at the forefront of green technology this is a shocking indictment of our solar technology base, particularly in light of the government's Green Industrial Revolution. We believe a planning requirement should be placed on this project to source at least 50% of the high-technology components (e.g. batteries and panels, not metal frames or cabling) from UK manufacturers.	NO	While it is true that the bulk of expertise in the manufacture of solar equipment exists outside of the UK, this does not undermine the case for the proposed Scheme. The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Sunnica Energy Farm and will source locally where possible. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This identifies a number of opportunities to promote local business involvement in the Scheme, including through building relationships with local business groups and by adopting a procurement strategy that maximises purchasing from local businesses. It is the Applicant's view that future manufacturing of such components in the UK is enabled through greater expertise and the locating of new solar projects in the UK.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	It is inconsistent with the objective for Green Energy to restore growth to the UK economy by supporting UK manufacturing as Sunnica representatives have said that UK lacks capacity to produce the quantity and quality of PV modules required.	NO	The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. This need is established in the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant does not therefore consider that the Scheme is inconsistent with the UK government's objectives, rather projects of this kind have an important role to play if the UK is to meet its legal requirement to decarbonise. The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Sunnica Energy Farm and will source locally where possible. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8], the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This identifies a number of opportunities to promote local business involvement in the Scheme, including through building relationships with local business groups and by adopting a procurement strategy that maximises purchasing from local businesses. It is the Applicant's view that future manufacturing of such components in the UK is enabled through greater expertise and the locating of new solar projects in the UK.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Most component parts are sourced from China and may be at risk of exploitation by the CCP.	NO	The Applicant recognises that there are risks of modern slavery being connected to UK businesses and supply chains and will comply with all legal obligations regarding modern slavery.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Cobalt is a conflict mineral, nearly half the world's supply is mined in the Democratic Republic of Congo where workers including children face appalling working conditions.	NO	The Applicant recognises that there are risks of modern slavery being connected to UK businesses and supply chains and will comply with all legal obligations regarding modern slavery.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Lithium is a finite resource, and its current consumption raises the question of whether cheaper and more abundant elements could be used?	NO	The Applicant recognises that there are supply constraints associated with elements such as lithium which is used in lithium ion batteries. At the current time this is the element that is being used within the majority of the battery technologies that are most advanced in the global market. Research is being conducted worldwide to produce batteries from more abundant materials driven by environmental and sustainable development concerns. The Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] confirms that batteries selected for use on the Scheme will be from UK tier 1 manufacturers and will utilise lithium-ion chemistry. The Applicant has considered other alternative technologies in its assessment of alternatives in the Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. This will provide the UK with enhanced energy security in the short and medium term. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The extraction of lithium has a huge environmental cost in areas such as Tibet and Bolivia where scarce water resources are being used to harvest this mineral.	NO	The Applicant recognises that there are environmental constraints associated with elements such as lithium which is used in lithium ion batteries. At the current time this is the element that is being used within the majority of the battery technologies that are most advanced in the global market. Research is being conducted worldwide to produce batteries from more abundant materials driven by environmental and sustainable development concerns. The Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] confirms that batteries selected for use on the Scheme will be from UK tier 1 manufacturers and will utilise lithium-ion chemistry. The Applicant has considered other alternative technologies in its assessment of alternatives in the Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Sunnica Energy Farm to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. This will provide the UK with enhanced energy security in the short and medium term. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	There will be a detrimental impact to the minerals site at Red Lodge.	NO	The Order limits lie within the Worlington Quarry and Barton Mills Chalk quarry safeguarding zones identified in the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan July 2020. Mineral deposits within Minerals Safeguarding Areas will not be permanently sterilised by the Scheme and can be extracted, if required, after its decommissioning. It is considered that this satisfies the requirements of the Cambridgeshire and Suffolk Mineral Safeguarding policies. Further information can be found in the Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2].

Appendix J-4: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008

Table J-4.1 below sets out responses to the statutory consultation from consultees under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Section 6.5 of the **Consultation Report [EN010106/5.1]**.

Table J-4.1: Regard had to comments from consultees under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	The Scheme takes valuable farmland out of agricultural production. This damages the rural economy and harms national food security.	Landowner	No	The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Sites is classed as not being 'Best and Most Versatile' land. Agricultural land is not lost to the temporary development and agricultural production will be maintained throughout as site will be grazed by sheep. The fallow period created by the scheme being in situ will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	Your EIA process makes no reference to damage to food supply.	Landowner	No	The scope of the EIA, as agreed with the Planning Inspectorate, does not include an assessment on food security. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the Sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. It is also important to note that the Scheme will not involve the permanent loss of farmland. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of a Scheme's lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during a Scheme's operational lifetime. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new,

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Land use	This is good grade A agricultural land which following Brexit will be needed for crops.	Landowner	No	Assessment of the agricultural land quality and versatility follows Natural England Guidance given in TIN049. The majority of the land (96.2%) within the Order limits is classed as not being 'Best and Most Versatile' land. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 12B [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	The Scheme will damage sub-soil.	Landowner	No	An extended fallow period will enable recovery of soil organic matter and remediation of deep soil compaction caused by cultivation and high axle load farm vehicles such as harvesters and trailers. The solar farm will have no corresponding adverse effect on subsoil. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	I own Brookside Stud Badlingham, my boundary with E19 field is half a mile long, half of my paddocks are separated from this by a six foot hedge. The height of your panels are over	Landowner	No	The height of the solar modules will be limited to 2.5m above ground level, the design parameters for the Scheme are outlined in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	eleven foot! During construction I would not be able to use these paddocks, we board / breed racehorses from across Europe. Thoroughbreds are very flighty animals and this kind of construction, hammering large posts into the ground could cause Injury, Abortion or even Death, to which you would be accountable. I am sure the owners of the injured horses would not hesitate in taking Legal Action against whoever was responsible. Alternatively, if I did not put horses in those paddocks that would seriously impede on my business financially, who would compensate me for my loss of earnings?			The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operations. Noise impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. This is set out Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP, a Framework CEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	The nature of a Scheme like this is inappropriate for the area	Landowner	No	An analysis of potential alternative locations for the Scheme was undertaken as included in Appendix 4A: Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				appropriate. A full environmental impact assessment has been conducted including the suite of specialist studies and the demonstrates that the impacts from the site are appropriate. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	A Scheme such as this industrialises the area.	Landowner	Yes	We do not consider that the Scheme as presented will industrialise the local area. An Alternative Sites Assessment has been submitted with the DCO Application in Appendix 4A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This, as well as the Alternatives chapter (Chapter 4 of the ES [EN010106/AP/6.1]) describes the process followed to consider alternative sites during the Scheme design development, and how the final Order limits were set. A suite of specialist reports has been undertaken by the Applicant to assess the potential impacts resulting from the Scheme. These include a full landscape and visual impact assessment alongside a landscape character assessment that have been undertaken regarding the Scheme. Full details of each of these assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Taking into account the feedback from the PEIR and the results of the specialist surveys and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				studies a suite of landscape mitigation measures and design changes have been proposed to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. This has included the removal of some areas previously suggested for solar use; the addition of 'set back' areas from field edges closest to human receptors and the introduction of a large amount of tree and grassland planting. These measures are shown on the Parameter Plans in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Land use	The Scheme will end farming on the land for a long time as it will take years to bring the land back into agricultural production.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will be in operation for at least 40 years. Once decommissioned and infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production immediately if required. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. It is also important to note that the Scheme will not involve the permanent loss of farmland. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of a Scheme's lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during a Scheme's operational lifetime. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	Using the land for tree planting would have greater benefit than using it for solar panels.	Landowner	No	The purpose of the climate assessment in the EIA is to identify the impact of the Scheme on the climate. The operation of the solar farm has been assessed to result in a major beneficial (significant) effect on the global climate. As per the IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions for an Environmental Impact Assessment, the Lifecycle GHG Impact Assessment presented in Chapter 6: Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] considers the impact of land use change from the current use (i.e. largely agricultural land, with some trees and hedgerows present) to the use associated with the proposed Scheme. The climate change assessment of land use change as a result of the Scheme is anticipated to have a temporary beneficial GHG impact of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e) for the duration of the operational phase, largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland. It is not within the scope of the EIA to compare the GHG impact of the Scheme to other types of land use.
Land use	The current Sunnica plan includes a large amount of our farm within the scheme. The	Landowner	Yes	The Order Limits have now been reduced at this location in order to take into account the garden boundary. The Order Limits now does not

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	plan sent to us on 2nd November shows a movement of the boundary of the scheme (without any discussion or consent) to my garden boundary and a greater area of the farm. The new red line brings in my cattle grazing land and I have nowhere else for them to graze.			(knowingly) include a significant portion of the cattle grazing land referred to. Negotiations are on-going with the relevant landowner(s) to secure a voluntary agreement with the landowner for the rights to include land from their farm within the Scheme. Further information can be found in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2] and Land Plans [EN010106/APP/2.1]. Details regarding the negotiations can be found within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].
Land use	After we leave the EU, where will the food come from to feed the country?	Landowner	No	The UK is still following the vast majority of EU single market rules for food and is likely to continue to do so for many years. A move away from the EU single market for food would enable relaxation of quotas for food imports from outside the EU.
Land use	The farmland in the area is highly productive and will be lost as a result of the Scheme.	Landowner	No	The majority of the land (96.2%) within the sites is classed as not being 'Best and Most Versatile' land. The consent would be temporary with no loss of agricultural land resource. The extended fallow period would enable a recovery of depleted soil organic matter. An assessment of the agricultural quality and versatility has been provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. Once decommissioned and infrastructure removed, the land can be returned to agricultural production. The Applicant recognises that the role of the planning system to assess the balance of the impact of withdrawing land from agricultural production for a period of time against the benefits of renewable energy generation. A fallow period will allow recovery of soil organic matter and remediate deep compaction from cultivation. Non-food crops are already grown in this area and on land within the sites, including crop maize for anaerobic digesters and forage for the prominent local equestrian sector. The change in agricultural land-use within the Order limits and any direct effects due to this are analysed in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1]. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the land used for the Scheme. In line with the requirements of the NPPF, the Applicant has sought to avoid using agricultural land considered to be 'best and most versatile' (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Details of this assessment can be found in Appendix 12B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. It is also important to note that the Scheme will

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				not involve the permanent loss of farmland. It is possible to restore land used for solar energy generation to farmland at the end of a Scheme's lifetime. Additionally, it is possible to use land within a solar farm for a number of agricultural purposes, including grazing, during a Scheme's operational lifetime. The Applicant is bringing forward the Scheme to meet an urgent national need for new, renewable, sources of electricity. Further information on this is provided within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted as part of the DCO application.
Land use	There will be a loss of amenities for local walkers.	Landowner	Yes	All existing Public Rights of Way within the Scheme boundary are retained and will remain accessible during the operational phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some public rights of way during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary; the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. As the PRowS will be closed for a short duration (maximum of 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Views from PRoWs during construction will be affected, in a number of cases there will be significant effects on views during construction due to machinery presence. These effects are described and detailed in Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The overall effect on amenity on PRoW users during construction from noise and visual impacts as well as PRoW closures (effect interactions) is assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. No significant effects are predicted from these effect interactions on users. The Scheme proposes new permissive routes; indicative locations (subject to final agreement with the landowners) are adjacent to Beck Road, to north-west of Sunnica East Site A; south of Freckenham Road, to the north-east of Sunnica East Site B (two new routes intersecting the existing diagonal unclassified bridleway U6006); and on Elms Road, to the south of Sunnica East Site B. These are shown in Figure 3-1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.3] Views from PRoW during operation will also be affected, in a number of cases there will be significant effects (see Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]) These effects are expected to reduce to non-significant over time

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				as the vegetation planting intended for screening of the Scheme matures.
Land use	Equestrian use has not been properly considered.	Landowner	Yes	Equestrian use has been considered and local gallops / equestrian centres have been consulted throughout. The Applicant has met with the representatives of the Snailwell Gallops to discuss the effects of the Scheme and has agreed to not begin noisy construction activities in the Works Areas of Sunnica West Site A until 10am to avoid disturbing their training. This measure is included in Appendix 16C Framework CEMP of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The local Gallops / equestrian centres have been considered in the Glint and Glare Assessment (presented in Appendix 16A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]). No significant glint and glare effects are anticipated, because reflections from the solar modules were found not to be geometrically possible. The Applicant has considered potential effects on PRowS including bridleways. During the operational phase, all existing PRowS will be retained and accessible. During construction and decommissioning of the Sunnica East Site A, there could be a temporary significant adverse effect on users of bridleways W/257/007/0 and W-257/002/X between Freckenham and Isleham

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				due to these conjoining routes being temporarily severed, preventing access. As mitigation, the temporary closures will be supported by appropriate and clearly signed alternative routes and where possible will be planned and programmed to minimise disruption to users. No significant effects are identified on other bridleways. Detail is contained within Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land-Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Land use	The closure of all Rights of Way inside the red line boundary during the construction period is excessive and needs to be reviewed.	Landowner	Yes	The Applicant is proposing to temporarily close some public rights of way during construction. The PRowS would be closed for the shortest timeframe necessary; the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] assumes as a worst case scenario that each PRow will be closed for up to three weeks during the construction phase. When a PRow is closed, there are alternative options available in the local area. Foreseeable closures of PRowS will be outlined in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010106/APP/6.1] and scheduled based on the final design which will aim to minimise the duration of closure. As the PRowS will be closed for a short duration (maximum of 3 weeks) no diversions have been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Land use	There are concerns that the land is valuable for crops and local food production. The land in question is predominately grade 3 or 4 (In a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being the most productive). In other words, the land is only productive if it is doused with pesticides and fertiliser (hence there is very little visible wildlife in the fields). In the case of the Chippenham land it would be even less productive if it didn't have the benefit of a reservoir to water it during the increasingly dry summers. (Which is not sustainable in the long term as extraction licences come to an end.)	Landowner	No	The Applicant thanks you for your feedback. An assessment of agricultural land classification has been provided in Appendix 12B [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The results of the ALC Survey in the Chippenham land show that the land is predominantly Grade 3b and 4 land, with a small pocket of Grade 3a land (Figures 12-2 and 12-3 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]).
Land use	The landowners may very well be left with a BIG clean up job, before it can be returned to productive agricultural farmland again, if at all. My fear is that it will become permanent Light Industrial land.	Landowner	No	The extended fallow period will enable a recovery of soil organic matter depleted by cultivation. Agricultural use of the land will be maintained through the grazing of sheep. Anything other than returning the land to its current use would require a separate planning application or development consent order application, in the same way as housing or industrial uses require this consent now. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				its existing use and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be prepared which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. A Framework DEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] as part of the DCO Application. It is proposed that ecological enhancement areas will be left and that these areas will not be returned to their existing state by the Applicant. However, once the land is returned to the landowner, the Applicant will no longer have control over the management of this land and it may be returned to agricultural use. Sunnica Ltd will be required to abide by the DCO consent (which will secure the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan) and legislation relevant at the time.
Land use	Within as little as 10 miles, certainly 20, there are plenty of sites where a solar farm could be laid out with no upset	Landowner	No	The Applicant has followed a step by step process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large scale solar farm. This has considered land within a 15km search area from the point of connection at Burwell National Grid Substation. Details of the process are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Land use	For food production to be sustainable in the long term, we need to adjust agricultural techniques, i.e., we will need to use “regenerative agriculture” which includes reduced tillage, permanent ground cover including cover crops to protect soil structure, and crop rotation. The soil under the solar panels will be regenerated over the next 40 years by not being spayed or ploughed (which releases carbon and damages the soil structure), and by having permanent ground cover. By taking this land out of intensive food production over the next 40 years, there will be a huge benefit the soil and future food production in the long term.	Landowner	No	The Applicant agrees that an extended suspension of cultivation and maintenance of a permanent green cover will enable a recovery of depleted soil organic matter and remediation of deep soil compaction.
Land use	Approve of solar power in principle but this Scheme is inappropriate for this area.	Landowner	No	An analysis of potential alternative locations for the Scheme was undertaken as included in the Alternative Sites Assessment, Appendix 4A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. This analysis demonstrates that the site location is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				appropriate. Furthermore, the Scheme includes a range of landscape mitigation measures such as tree planting and setbacks to ensure that it sites appropriately within the area.
Land use	Equestrian users risk disturbance noise from inverters, switchgear, etc. Example; Bridleway 204/5 (south east of Snailwell village).	Landowner	No	The Applicant is proposing to locate solar stations (which is where inverters and switchgears will be located) away from PROWs. The proposed locations for solar stations can be found in the parameter plans included in the Environmental Statement (ES) figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3] and secured through the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2]. The locations of existing PROWs are shown in Figure 12-4. Those PROWs to be affected during construction are shown in Figure 12-5. The Applicant recognises the importance of incorporating features within the Scheme design to minimise disturbance to those living, working and visiting the area. An Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) will be followed throughout operation to ensure that potential environmental effects during operation are avoided, mitigated and managed where necessary. A Framework OEMP has been submitted with the DCO in Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	The proximity of the 'Scheme to homes is a concern. In particular to Snailwell, Red Lodge, Worlington, Freckenham and Isleham.	Landowner	Yes	The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential dwellings. For example, at Snailwell the Scheme is well screened from view by existing vegetation. The Scheme will not be visible to any of the homes at Red Lodge as it is situated on the other side of the A11 and screened from view by existing vegetation. The Scheme has been set well back from Worlington where possible using landscape mitigation such as offsets with native grassland planting and new tree planting. The Scheme has changed its layout to avoid impacts on Freckenham, locating solar impacts well back from the village and away from the Freckenham Road. The Scheme has also designed its landscaping strategy in order to mitigate impacts on Isleham. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3] and the Parameter plans outlining these proposed changes can be found in the Environmental Statement figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3]. Chapter 10 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] presents the landscape and visual impact assessment. Appendix 10I of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2] presents the Outline

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP).
Design	Underground cables intrude on agricultural land	Landowner	No	The underground cables will cross agricultural land. However, they will be buried at a suitable depth to enable the field above to remain in active cultivation with the existing soil replaced on top of the cables. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. The detailed dimensions for the underground cables and associated works can be found within Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	The Scheme is too large and concentrated in a certain area.	Landowner	Yes	The need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size. The Scheme design has evolved to avoid concentration in any one area. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3] and the Parameter plans outlining these proposed changes can be found in the Environmental Statement figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Design	You are proposing to have the largest sola farm in the UK, if not Europe all within close proximity of people's homes.	Landowner	Yes	The Scheme has where possible aimed to set back from residential dwellings and incorporate landscape mitigation and layout design measures to reduce the impact on residential

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				dwellings. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3] and the Parameter plans outlining these proposed changes can be found in the Environmental Statement figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Design	Details of battery longevity and capacity have not been provided.	Landowner	No	Battery technology is evolving rapidly as is the market and therefore the services that the batteries can be required to perform evolving rapidly. The batteries will be installed as associated development to the PV modules and will deliver services to enable and enhance the performance of the PV modules. They may also be called upon to deliver services to the National Grid. The longevity of the batteries depends on the level of throughput of electricity through the batteries and this will only be known at final design and may evolve during operation to suit market demand. The parameters for the battery storage element can be found within Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	Why are the solar sites so far from the Burwell sub-station?	Landowner	No	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step process to confirm that the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large scale solar farm. This has considered land within a 15km search area from the point of connection at Burwell National Grid Substation. Details of the process

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Design	We would like to know if the underground cable passes through any part of the woodland at Wildtracks?	Landowner	No	The underground cables will not pass through any of the woodland at Wildtracks. Further information can be found in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2]. Parameter plans outlining the proposed changes since the PEIR can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Design	The design means that the fields with the panels in them are spread over a large area, to make them LESS visible. (The site has also been designed so that the panels are set back to make them less visible from the edges). Surely this is preferable to one enormous solar farm?	Landowner	No	This is correct the design has included layout design and landscape mitigation in order to reduce the visual impact and any harm towards the landscape character. Parameter plans outlining the proposed changes since the PEIR can be found in the Environmental Statement Figures [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Design	Godolphin's training facilities are adjacent to the proposal and Snailwell and I would want to see significant mitigation measures to protect horses and people from the impact of noise and visually	Landowner	No	Assessment of potential disturbances such as noise, glint and glare, and vibration have been assessed as part of the Applicant's EIA. The results of these assessments are presented in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	before, during and after construction.			The Applicant's assessments have concluded that there will be no significant noise impact at receptor R4 Snailwell during both construction and operations. The full results of these assessments are presented in chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. A glint and glare assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 16A of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. No significant effects were identified on the receptors at Godolphin's training facilities. The Applicant has developed its proposals for construction based upon the outcomes of its assessments. The Applicant's proposals for managing construction impacts from the Scheme are set out in the Framework CEMP, Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Design	Can you confirm that you are planting out the entrance to the Brook Land opposite the Wildtracks entrance?	Landowner	No	The Applicant can confirm that it will not be planting out the entrance to the Brook Land opposite the Wildtracks entrance. This is because there will be no PV modules in the fields immediately to the south of the Wildtracks entrance and therefore no impacts to mitigate in this area. Further information can be found in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.2]. The Parameter plans outlining the proposed changes since the PEIR can be found in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Environmental Statement figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Design	Sunnica West sites A and B will have less impact on the area and people than East sites A and B. It is next to a major road which is better.	Landowner	No	The impacts resulting from the Scheme have been evaluated through the environmental impact assessment process. The Scheme design has evolved to reduce and mitigate potential impacts where possible. The Parameter plans outlining the proposed changes since the PEIR can be found in the Environmental Statement figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Design	Smaller solar farms next to highways would be better.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step process to confirm that the location of the Scheme is suitable for a large scale solar farm. This has considered land within a 15km search area from the point of connection at Burwell National Grid Substation. Details of the process are set out in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and Appendix 4A Alternative Sites Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The case for why a solar farm of this scale is needed is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Design	Please confirm that there will be no above ground cabling.	Landowner	No	For the most part the cabling for the Scheme will be buried. There are some elements of the cabling that will not be buried such as DC cabling which is attached to the back of the PV modules or could be in cable trays along the ground within the BESS areas. Further information detailing the specifications of all of the cables assessed can be found within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Design	The scale of the scheme is disproportionate – it is so much larger than anything else in the UK.	Landowner	No	The Need for the Scheme is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This demonstrates that there is a need for a Scheme of this size. The Scheme design has evolved to avoid concentration in any one area. The Parameter plans outlining the proposed changes since the PEIR can be found in the Environmental Statement figures 3-1 and 3-2 [EN010106/APP/6.3].
Economy	The Scheme will be built using imported equipment. This undermines UK manufacturing and creates a dependency on foreign manufacturers.	Landowner	No	A procurement process will be run ahead of construction to source all of the equipment and labour required for the construction of the Scheme and following the final design of the Scheme. Where possible, equipment and labour will be sourced locally. However, it is likely there will be instances where this is not possible as the equipment is best sourced from other countries owing to the lack of manufacturing capacity in the United Kingdom. A requirement to Schedule

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				2 of the DCO will secure the implementation of a Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan to help identify opportunities for individuals and businesses to access employment and supply chain opportunities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Scheme. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8] as part of its DCO application.
Economy	The benefits go to large companies whereas there are no benefits for local people.	Landowner	No	The Applicant is committed to providing a legacy of community benefits through the Scheme. This includes a dedicated skills programme designed to provide local people with opportunities to work on an operational solar and battery storage installation. The Applicant is committed to maximising the local economic benefits of the Scheme and will source locally where possible. This would be delivered via the Skills and Employment Plan, the implementation of which is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8] as part of its DCO application. The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Scheme on employment locally. The results of this assessment are set out in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				It is estimated that construction will generate 1,685 net additional jobs per annum, of which 1,483 will be within 45 minutes travel time of the Scheme, and operation will generate 29 net additional jobs, of which 27 will be within 45 minutes travel time of the Scheme.
Economy	Understand that some of the components for the Scheme will be manufactured in China. China and the Chinese Communist Party have shown themselves to be hostile towards western interests.	Landowner	No	A procurement process will be run ahead of construction to source all of the equipment and labour required for the construction of the Scheme and following the final design of the Scheme. Where possible, equipment and labour will be sourced locally. A requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO will secure the implementation of a Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan to help identify opportunities for individuals and businesses to access employment and supply chain opportunities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Scheme. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8] as part of its DCO application. However, it is likely there will be instances where this is not possible as the equipment is best sourced from other countries owing to the lack of manufacturing capacity in the United Kingdom. At the time of running the procurement, care will be taken to ensure that the supply chain from

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				where the equipment is sourced avoids that which is ecologically damaging or exploitative.
Economy	Wherever the components are to be made, now or in the future, they depend on a number of rare elements, the source of the bulk of which is controlled by China. Mining and extracting these elements is ecologically damaging and exploits workers in Africa and elsewhere.	Landowner	No	The Applicant will run a procurement process to source the equipment ahead of construction. It may be that some of the equipment will be sourced internationally including from China. At the time of running the procurement care will be taken to ensure that the supply chain from where the equipment is sourced avoids that which is ecologically damaging or exploitative in Africa or globally. Where possible equipment and labour will be sourced locally. A requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO will secure the implementation of a Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan to help identify opportunities for individuals and businesses to access employment and supply chain opportunities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Scheme. The Applicant has provided an Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010106/APP/7.8] as part of its DCO application.
Economy	Other countries do not intend to use more environmentally friendly methods of electricity	Landowner	No	The need case for the Scheme has been set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. This shows that there is a need for the Scheme owing to its specific characteristics promoting the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	generation and out compete the UK as a result.			transition to low carbon methods of energy generation.
Renewable energy	Solar energy is unreliable compared to other forms of energy generation. This damages the UK's energy security.	Landowner	No	Solar energy generation is a proven technology and forms an integral part of the energy generation mix within the United Kingdom both now and going forward. There is an established need for solar energy generation and the Scheme will make a significant contribution to meeting that need. Further details that relate to the need for solar generation technology can be found within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Renewable energy	Solar energy is expensive when compared to other renewable energy sources and is poor value for the consumer and UK industry.	Landowner	No	Electricity generated from PV modules is very competitively priced when compared to other renewable energy sources and represents good value for the consumer and the UK industry. The Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] submitted with this DCO application includes a section titled "Solar is economically efficient in GB" and explains that solar energy generation is economically very competitive both against other conventional and renewable energy generation.
Renewable energy	Solar panels and batteries contain elements that can be polluting. As relatively new technology, what evidence do you have about the future	Landowner	No	The creation of waste during decommissioning is considered in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and so the effects of this has been considered in the Environmental Statement. Significant effects

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	disposal or recycling of these materials?			from waste are not anticipated during decommissioning (or construction or operation). Possibilities to re-use or recycle materials will be explored as a priority before resorting to landfill options. There is a new industry emerging for recycling PV modules. This would be explored, in addition to any resale of any operational modules, prior to decommissioning. Sunnica is committed to compliance with the waste hierarchy when decommissioning plant used in the Scheme and this includes both PV modules and batteries. It is not possible to say now exactly how decommissioning will take place at this stage and therefore Sunnica proposes to secure the provision of a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP), which will include a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), prior to the commencement of decommissioning. A Framework DEMP is included in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], which details further measures that will be required for waste management during decommissioning. The Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan includes proposals to ensure that waste disposal is carried out in accordance with the waste

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				hierarchy and where waste disposal is unavoidable that it is responsibly disposed of.
Renewable energy	This is just a 'stop gap' solution until something better comes along.	Landowner	No	There is a very clear need for electricity generation and further there is a need for a proportion of that electricity generation to be met by solar electricity generation. This case is clearly set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. Electricity created through solar can be brought online quickly. This will help to meet the need for electricity generation in the medium term, while other forms of electricity will often take longer. Solar energy is expected to form part of the UK's energy mix for the foreseeable future.
Renewable energy	The Scheme is large but there will be many more produced at this scale.	Landowner	No	The scale of the Scheme is explained and justified in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Renewable energy	Like all developments of this type the efficiency of the panels and batteries will greatly reduce with time, so how can they be efficient over 40 years.	Landowner	No	The electricity generation produced by the modules will reduce as the modules age owing to the nature of the technology. This has been accounted for within the assumptions that feed into the needs case assessment which demonstrates that despite this reduction in performance over time there remains an economic case for the low carbon electricity produced by the solar. Further details of this assessment can be found at section 9.2 within

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1]. During the Scheme's operating life, the operator may replace PV modules where degradation is such that they are no longer viable. The batteries that will be utilised within the BESS will degrade over time depending on how they are used. The batteries will be replaced as deemed necessary in order for them to perform as required. Despite this degradation in performance of the batteries there is still an economic case for the services that the batteries perform. Further details can be found within section 10.4 of the needs case analysis in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Renewable energy	Support solar and wind power but not at the expense of damaging the countryside.	Landowner	No	The Scheme has been designed to minimise the effect it will have on the countryside. The Scheme has sought to avoid ecological features and sites designated for nature conservation. Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impacts on ecology receptors and conclude there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. In addition, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has assessed the impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual receptors and sought to reduce the potential effects of the Scheme

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				through embedded mitigation which has been built into the Scheme design.
Renewable energy	Solar panels should be placed on factory roofs, warehouses and new build homes instead.	Landowner	No	PV modules are being placed on factory roofs, warehouses and new build homes as well as in large-scale settings such as the Scheme. There is a demonstrated need for the Scheme to be built at the scale it is and this is set out in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1] in the section titled Solar is Economically Efficient in GB.
Renewable energy	The proposed 40 years of use does not allow for the rapid change and progress of renewable energy technology. Will the energy farm become redundant and have a much shorter useful life?	Landowner	No	The Scheme has been designed for a 40-year operational lifetime. The needs case assessment demonstrates that there is a need for the electricity that will be generated from the Scheme over this 40-year operational lifetime period. Details of this can be found within the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Renewable energy	The Scheme is absolutely necessary if we are to meet the government's target of zero carbon by 2050, to slow the devastating effects of global warming, our greatest threat.	Landowner	No	The Applicant agrees with the landowner. Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] concluded that "the renewable energy generation of the Scheme overall is considered to have a major beneficial effect on the climate".
Ecology	Your EIA process makes no reference to damage to the habitats of hares, pheasants and	Landowner	No	An assessment of the impacts on all ecological features, including mammals and birds, for all aspects of the Scheme's life, is presented in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	partridges. The construction, operation and dismantling will each cause disruption to their living and breeding.			Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation Although not considered directly in the ES (but hares are), it is considered that the same conclusions would apply to pheasants and partridges.
Ecology	The Scheme is intrusive towards wildlife.	Landowner	No	The Scheme has sought to integrate the development into the existing environment, retaining areas important to wildlife, including woodlands, hedgerows, areas of grasslands and watercourses. An assessment of the impacts on all ecological features is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation.
Ecology	The Scheme will cause damage to flora and fauna, disruption, and damage to roads, hedges and trees	Landowner	No	The Scheme will retain areas important for flora and fauna, including woodlands, hedgerows areas of grasslands and watercourses as far as is possible. Where features and habitat cannot be retained (e.g. removal of an area of hedgerow for construction of access roads), mitigation measures will be adopted to minimise the effect on wildlife during vegetation clearance. Vegetation will be planted and re-instated where

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				it is not utilised for operations across the Order limits following construction. An assessment of the impacts on all ecological features is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction, including re-instatement of trees, hedges and roads. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction. The parameter plans in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] show the locations of the proposed landscape planting for the Scheme.
Ecology	The Scheme is likely to displace wildlife due to noise and movement.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will retain areas important for flora and fauna, including woodlands, hedgerows areas of grasslands and watercourses. An assessment of the impacts on all ecological features, including from noise, is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction.
Ecology	The Scheme will create a loss of vegetation which in turn impacts upon CO2 capture.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will retain areas of habitat and vegetation important to ecology and nature conservation. 292ha of land within the Order limits (approximately 30% of the Scheme area) will be planted with species -rich native grassland, hedgerows, trees and wetland. The fields containing PV modules will also be sown with grassland seed mixes to maintain vegetation across the Scheme and increase the benefits for biodiversity. An assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on all ecological features, including habitats and vegetation is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				A greenhouse gas assessment is provided within Chapter 6: Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. The climate change assessment has not specifically assessed land use change as a result of the Scheme. In order to ensure that the EIA considers a worst case scenario for the Scheme, the assessment assumed that the current greenhouse gas emissions from the current agricultural land use is zero. However, the change in land use from farmed fields to PV modules is anticipated to have a temporary beneficial effect on the global climate of around 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ e) for the duration of the operational phase, largely due to the conversion of large areas of cropland to grassland, which has a higher carbon sequestration value than cropland.
Ecology	The impact on the wildlife will be enormous. Destroying the wildlife corridors, feeding and nesting habitats. Once these have gone, they may not survive, and we will be left with a barren countryside.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will retain areas important as wildlife corridors, including woodlands, hedgerows and watercourses, to avoid a loss of connectivity for wildlife and fragmentation of habitats or species populations. The creation of diverse grasslands both within the areas to include PV modules, but also within the area of undeveloped land within the Scheme, will improve the connectivity for wildlife across the Scheme, improving links between areas of existing habitats. An assessment of impacts on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				all ecological features is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on ecology and nature conservation. In some places, such as at access points off roads, it will not be possible to retain vegetation during construction. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO to manage the effects during construction (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction, including re-instatement of trees, hedges and roads. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction. The parameter plans in figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3] show the locations of the proposed landscape planting for the Scheme. An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) is presented in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and is secured through the DCO.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Ecology	In total 214 hectares of embedded mitigation and biodiversity areas have been included in the plan. Yes, new planting takes time to mature, but in the big scheme of things, (huge benefits to biodiversity and carbon sequestration) really not long.	Landowner	No	Due to design changes following the PEIR, 292ha of the Scheme will not be subject to development and will be managed for biodiversity mitigation and enhancement. Throughout the Scheme developed areas will also be sown with diverse grassland seed mixes to benefit biodiversity and provisions to enhance existing habitat features, such as allowing hedgerows to grow taller and wider have also been incorporated. An assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on all ecological features is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan is presented in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and is secured through the DCO.
Ecology	Creating set-asides for stone curlews will not stop them from moving on due to noise and other disruption.	Landowner	No	The creation of habitat specifically for Stone Curlew within the Scheme has been carefully located to minimise the potential for effects from construction and decommissioning noise and disturbance and during operational maintenance visits. The siting of habitat for Stone Curlew has been informed by the birds' current use of the site and has been agreed through consultation with Natural England and the RSPB. The design of the habitat will be suitable for stone curlew as set out in the Offsetting Habitat Provision for

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Stone Curlew Specification [EN010106/APP/6.6] that has been developed in consultation with Natural England and the RSPB. An assessment on the impacts to Stone Curlew from the Scheme is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Ecology	The Scheme will reduce biodiversity.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7].
Ecology	Batteries can contaminate the ground and ground water system, damaging wildlife.	Landowner	No	As per Chapter 3, Scheme Description within the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1], the batteries will be housed in containers. This will ensure that any leakages will be contained and not result in contamination of the ground and groundwater.
Ecology	How are you going to ensure that your 2 years of construction won't have a negative impact on wildlife?	Landowner	No	An assessment of the impacts of construction on wildlife are presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on wildlife during construction of the Scheme. A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Scheme is visually intrusive.	Landowner	No	A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], has been undertaken to inform the design process and reduce the visibility of the Scheme as far as practicable. As set out in the LVIA the design has reduced the visibility of the Scheme by distancing the modules from villages and roads, retaining existing hedgerows, reducing the height of the modules to 2.5 metres and implementing substantial areas of new planting. These measures will reduce the Scheme, so that we consider it will not be visually intrusive. An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan is presented in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which sets out these measures and is secured through the DCO.
Landscape and	Even if replanting is undertaken it takes years to have any effect	Landowner	Yes	Replanting will be undertaken, as set out on the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2)

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
visual amenity	and the area is already rather open from hedges which have been removed in the past.			[EN010106/APP/6.3] and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) presented in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2], along with the retention of existing hedgerows, so as to provide immediate softening of views from many locations. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges there are parts of the Scheme where the PV modules will be visible in the short term due to the lack of existing vegetation and one of the aims of the landscape design is to increase the existing vegetation cover and replace lost hedgerows.
Landscape and visual amenity	The proposal doesn't provide for adequate screening – and even if there were more screening offered it will take at least a decade for the trees and shrubs to grow large enough to hide the panels.	Landowner	Yes	The parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2) [EN010106/APP/6.3] illustrate substantial new planting to screen the Scheme, in addition to reducing the visibility by offsetting the Scheme from roads and villages and retaining existing vegetation. This has been developed further to the responses received at statutory consultation. An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) is presented in Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which sets out these measures and is secured through the DCO. It is acknowledged that the new planting will take time to establish, but the pertinent matter is that

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				the new planting will reduce the visibility of the Scheme to increasing degrees as it established.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Scheme will damage the countryside and all of the benefits that it brings in terms of recreation.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will not damage the countryside as it is reversible and will be removed. There will be an increase in the recreational benefits as the Scheme proposes new permissive paths across Sunnica East sites A and B. This is in contrast to the existing situation, as the site is not publicly accessible.
Landscape and visual amenity	Burwell sub-station has already expanded to become an eyesore and this is one of three more schemes being brought forward in the area. It is too much development.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will retain existing trees and hedges around the proposed Substation at Burwell to reduce its visibility. The proposed substation will also be smaller than the existing sub-station. Locating a new substation adjacent to the existing Burwell sub-station is logical in landscape and visual terms as it consolidates similar land uses within the landscape and visual context.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Scheme will transform the feel of the area for a long period of time.	Landowner	No	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges that there will be a change to the character of the area. The Scheme design has sought to minimise this change through the careful siting of the PV modules and the provision substantial new planting and incorporation of setbacks.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Landscape and visual amenity	The new saplings shall take at least 15yrs to make any impact on the visual appearance on the fencing, leaving the panels clearly visible for many years.	Landowner	No	The new planting will soften the visual appearance of the Scheme to varying degrees once planted and therefore it will not take 15 years to 'make any impact' on the visual appearance of the Scheme. As illustrated on the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2) [EN010106/APP/6.3], the Scheme includes the retention of roadside vegetation and hedgerows, such that the existing vegetation will provide an immediate softening of views from many locations across the landscape.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) could cause a negative visual impact as they are up to 6 metres high.	Landowner	No	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges that the BESS will result in adverse visual effects once implemented. This has informed the Scheme design, with new areas of proposed tree planting around the BESS, so as to reduce the visual impact of the BESS. In addition, the colour tone of the BESS would be sympathetic to the colour tones of the landscape, so as to better integrate the BESS within the landscape.
Landscape and visual amenity	Trees and hedgerows will be lost during construction.	Landowner	No	There will be a loss of existing vegetation during the construction phase, mainly from enabling access into the fields. However, the extent of loss is very localised, with the construction phase requiring the implementation of tree

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				protection fencing to protect and retain existing vegetation. With reference to the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]), most of the existing vegetation retained as it provides an immediate filtering and softening to views of the Scheme. The amount of new planting across the Scheme is substantially greater than the vegetation lost during the construction phase. Vegetation along the cable route to be lost during the construction phase would be replanted following construction, as set out in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in Appendix 16C of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Landscape and visual amenity	Snailwell Gallops are private gallops for Godolphin. They are used 7 days a week throughout the year, from 7:30 to 10am. On the whole the gallops are well screened from the potential planning application site by dense planting belts, but there is a portion where there is insufficient planting to significantly screen the site. We are concerned that it may impact on their use of the gallops, firstly during the construction phase,	Landowner	No	During construction, works on the nearest areas of the Scheme to the Snailwell Gallops would not be undertaken until after 10am. A Glint and Glare Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Glint and Glare assessment has been undertaken by experienced professionals. During operation, solar reflections are geometrically possible towards the Snailwell Gallops and British Racing School. Screening in the form of existing vegetation will however obstruct views of the reflecting modules for horse and riders at both horse facilities, which will be further bolstered by

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	and then secondly the glare off the panels on sunny days.			the proposed vegetation shown on the Parameter Plans and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP). No impacts are predicted, and no further mitigation is required.
Landscape and visual amenity	Solar panels are unsightly	Landowner	No	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), as set out in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] acknowledges that views of PV modules are 'adverse'. The Scheme design has sought to minimise the visibility of the PV modules through their careful siting within the landscape and substantial new planting.
Landscape and visual amenity	The planting proposed is insufficient for mitigating the impact caused.	Landowner	No	With reference to the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]), there is substantial new planting across the Scheme to mitigate the landscape and visual effects, as reported in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
Landscape and visual amenity	How will you prevent the glare shining through my windows?	Landowner	No	A Glint and Glare Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Solar reflections are

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				geometrically possible for 116 out of the 222 assessed dwelling receptors (all dwelling receptors with a potential view of the modules). Views of the reflecting modules are considered possible for a minority of observers located in the surrounding dwellings under baseline conditions. At three of these dwellings, a moderate impact is predicted, which will remain until the mitigation measures have established and the reflecting modules are obstructed from view. Following the implementation and establishment of the mitigation measures, no impacts are predicted in practice and therefore no further mitigation is required. This is because for most of these dwellings, as views of the reflecting modules will be significantly screened by existing vegetation, proposed vegetation, and/or other surrounding dwellings. The remaining dwellings are located over 1km from the reflecting modules and so, although reflections are predicted, they are considered to have no impact in accordance with the assessment methodology presented in Appendix 16A of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Landscape and visual amenity	The Scheme will spoil the setting of the area, which has historic views over Newmarket Heath.	Landowner	No	Newmarket Heath is to the west of Newmarket. The closest part of the Scheme (Sunnica West Site A) is over 4km to the north-east of Newmarket Heath, to the north of the A14. There

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				is no visual relationship between Newmarket Heath and the Scheme.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Scheme should not diminish the natural aesthetic appearance of the Royal Worlington Golf Club.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will not diminish the appearance of the Golf Club as it will be set to the south of Golf Links Road. The existing roadside hedgerows between the Golf Club and the Scheme will be retained to enable an immediate visual screening.
Landscape and visual amenity	My home will be surrounded by Solar Panels. For the rest of my life, I will see Solar Panels from within my home and from my garden. Not a happy prospect.	Landowner	Yes	Negotiations between the landowner and the Applicant are ongoing. The Applicant is proposing to remove a number of works areas in Sunnica West Site A on their land. Areas W13, W14 and W16 (shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) have now been removed. The only area proposed for PV modules that now remains on this land is at W15 on the eastern side of the A11 (see Figure 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]). With reference to figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3], no property is surrounded by PV modules, with the Scheme offset from villages and individual properties. Once established, the proposed planting will screen the PV modules from residential properties as reported in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), Chapter

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The villages feel hemmed in by the solar farm. wherever go, we cannot fail to see them.	Landowner	No	With reference to the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement) [EN010106/APP/6.3], the PV modules have been offset from the villages and their associated roads to retain the perception of moving through the landscape and that arable fields form the setting to the villages. As an example, there are no PV modules to the west of Beck Road, so the landscape between Freckenham and Isleham remains as fields or grassland. In combination with the proposed planting, the visibility of the PV modules will be reduced by the distance from the villages, the intervening vegetation and the proposed planting.
Landscape and visual amenity	The Royal Worlington Golf Club and the course, both of which are world famous, share a common boundary with the proposed site of the development, which I am concerned will have an adverse environmental and visual impact on the course.	Landowner	No	The common boundary is part of Golf Links Road. With reference to the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3], the PV modules will be set back from Golf Links Road and the roadside hedgerows will be retained to provide immediate screening of modules from the south-east edge of the golf course. The combination of distance and intervening vegetation will screen the Scheme from the remainder of the Golf Course, as reported in Landscape and Visual

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Impact Assessment (LVIA), Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Landscape and visual amenity	The proposed planting to hide a 2.5 meter deer fence will not be effective for around 15 years.	Landowner	No	The new planting will soften the visual appearance of the Scheme to varying degrees once planted and therefore it will not take 15 years to before it is effective. As illustrated on the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.3]), the Scheme includes the retention of roadside vegetation and hedgerows, such that the existing vegetation will provide an immediate softening of views from many locations across the landscape.
Planning	The damage to habitats and wildlife is not worth the benefits of energy farms.	Landowner	No	There will be minimal damage to habitats and wildlife during construction of the Scheme. As a result of habitat creation and planting throughout the Scheme, to be established following construction and prior to operation, the Scheme will provide an approximate net gain in biodiversity of 83% for habitat units, 16% for hedgerow units and 1% for river units. Details of the biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010106/APP/6.7]. The ecology assessment set out in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] concluded no significant effects on habitats and wildlife. The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application sets out the benefits of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Scheme which include significant biodiversity net gain.
Planning	To the extent that there is a public benefit in the scheme that benefit will be completely outweighed by the harm that will be done to the local community, landscape and environment.	Landowner	No	The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application explains why the benefits of the Scheme outweigh the adverse effects. Overall, it concludes that there are no adverse effects that would outweigh the benefits of the Scheme. The Environmental Statement includes a wide range of assessments on the environmental effects of the Scheme on the local community and the landscape [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Planning	The National Infrastructure planning process will do more to ensure the project is as painless for communities as possible.	Landowner	No	The Applicant agrees with this assessment. The Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) planning process provides a number of opportunities for public involvement and the Applicant must have regard to the responses that it has received through the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the core chapters of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].
Planning	The Scheme will contravene some local planning policies with regard to climate and ecology.	Landowner	No	The Planning Statement [EN010106/APP/7.2] accompanying the DCO application assesses the Scheme against local planning policies which the Applicant believes are likely to be regarded as important and relevant to the decision as to whether to grant a DCO. This includes an

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				assessment of the Scheme's compliance with climate and ecology policies, which have been complied with.
EIA Process	There is insufficient detail provided to be confident that no damage will be caused to the land or water sources.	Landowner	No	The Scheme Description provided in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1], provides details of the Scheme. Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN/010106/APP/6.1] includes details of the water resources baseline, and their relative importance, together with the assessment process followed. Details of the baseline, and the Scheme are considered robust enough to determine that no significant adverse effects to land or water sources would result from the construction, operation, or decommissioning of the Scheme.
EIA Process	Do you really know what the operational impacts will be?	Landowner	No	Potential impacts anticipated during the operation phase of the Scheme have been discussed in Chapter 6 to 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. These chapters have been written by experienced specialists who are professionals in their technical field.
EIA Process	Why has no analysis occurred to assess the carbon footprint of the project?	Landowner	No	The Applicant has undertaken a lifecycle GHG impact assessment, which assesses the impact of GHG emissions arising over the lifetime of the Scheme on the climate. This is presented in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Chapter 6 Climate Change of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Heritage	The proposal is too close to the avenue to Chippenham Hall to the detriment of a registered park. East Cambridgeshire District Council in its comments on the PEIR concluded that the Scheme would cause a permanent adverse effect.	Landowner	Yes	The Applicant has revised the Scheme design in this area and is incorporating greater setbacks with a new planting regime along the avenue at parcels W04 and W05 (as shown in Figure 3-2 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1]). Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [EN/1010106/APP/6.1] presents the potential impacts and concludes that the Scheme will result in a moderate adverse (significant) effect on the setting of Chippenham Registered Park and Gardens during construction and operation.
Human Health	Concern that people will be exploited through the supply chain for the Scheme components e.g. mining of minerals	Landowner	No	The procurement of materials for the construction of the Scheme will be subject to all relevant UK laws, including all in relation to exploitation of workforces in the supply chain. At the time of running the procurement, care will be taken to ensure that the supply chain from where the equipment is sourced avoids that which is ecologically damaging or exploitative.
Human Health	I have seen no Battery Safety Management Plan.	Landowner	No	An Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan has been submitted with the DCO [EN010106/APP/7.6].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Human Health	Batteries such as those proposed here have already been banned in America after they have caused major fires. There has also been a large fire at a site in Liverpool.	Landowner	No	Lessons learned from the fire in America have been studied based on the DNV GL McMicken Battery Energy Storage System Event Technical Analysis and Recommendations (2020). The Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] has considered the experience gained from these projects and implemented solutions where practical and effective for safety and property protection. With regards to the Liverpool fire, we are not aware of any publication which has investigated the cause of the fire and therefore have not been able to consider lessons learned from this. The batteries that are proposed to be installed within the Scheme have not been banned in America. There are many similar schemes operational and planned in America. The risk of fire is something that the Applicant is taking very seriously and as a result the Applicant has developed the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (OBFSMP) through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service). The plan has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Details can be found within the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6]. The design principles to be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				applied to the Battery Energy Storage Systems are detailed in this management plan.
Human Health	Concerned at the safety of the battery storage.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has developed an Outline Battery Safety Fire Management Plan (OBFSMP) in order to evaluate, mitigate and be fully prepared for the risks associated with the battery technology. The Plan has been developed through consultation with the local planning authorities, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (who have also responded on behalf of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) and has also been shared with the Health and Safety Executive. Further details can be found in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6]. The following overall measures will be implemented during detailed design to minimise the risk of battery fire; - Components that comply with all relevant legislation and the design principles set out in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] will be used; - The manufacturer will undertake extensive testing and analysis to assess fire risk;

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				- A heating and cooling system will be provided on each BESS enclosure to prevent the battery system experiencing overheating or freezing environments; - The installation area and equipment will be protected from flooding, which has the potential to cause electrical fires. The risk of flooding has been assessed as part of the Flood Risk Assessment in Appendix 9C: of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and mitigation measures to protect it from flooding have been recommended which will be developed as part of the detailed design; - Installation areas will comply with appropriate local fire, electrical and building code requirements, including access to fire trucks in case of emergency; - Fire detection systems, such as multispectral infrared flame detectors, will be installed to detect any fire; - Two sources of firefighting water will be installed on site during operation. These include internal automated sprinkler or water mist system and firefighting water for the Fire and Rescue team;

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				- Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container; - Each BESS compound requires a maximum of 242.5m³ of water storage for use by fire fighters in case of an unplanned fire in the BESS compound. Water would either be stored two half capacity sectional steel panel tank or two half capacity cylindrical steel panel tanks; - Each BESS area would be lined with an impermeable surface to prevent water used during firefighting operations infiltrating into the soils underlying the BESS area. Each BESS area would also require a bunded lagoon capable of capturing 242.5m³ of fire water. The lagoon would have a volume of approximately 410m³, which would allow the water to be stored following an emergency event and removed from site if contaminated; and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				- The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. In addition to the above, a Fire Emergency Response Plan and a Fire Service Site Specific Risk Assessment will be produced for each BESS area. This will be secured through the Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP), the implementation of which is secured via a requirement to the DCO.
Human Health	The lithium-ion batteries that will be used in the Scheme are highly susceptible to thermal runaway and can cause fires and explosions. The gas emitted in these fires, hydrogen fluoride, is highly toxic and can have severe impacts on human health.	Landowner	No	The following overall measures will be implemented during detailed design to minimise the risk of battery fire; - Components that comply with all relevant legislation and the design principles set out in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6] will be used; - The manufacturer will undertake extensive testing and analysis to assess fire risk; - A heating and cooling system will be provided on each BESS enclosure to prevent the battery system experiencing overheating or freezing environments;

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				- The installation area and equipment will be protected from flooding, which has the potential to cause electrical fires. The risk of flooding has been assessed as part of the Flood Risk Assessment in Appendix 9C: of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] and mitigation measures to protect it from flooding have been recommended which will be developed as part of the detailed design; - Installation areas will comply with appropriate local fire, electrical and building code requirements, including access to fire trucks in case of emergency; - Fire detection systems, such as multispectral infrared flame detectors, will be installed to detect any fire; - Two sources of firefighting water will be installed on site during operation. These include internal automated sprinkler or water mist system and firefighting water for the Fire and Rescue team; - Each BESS container will be fitted within an automatic sprinkler or water mist system for fire suppression in the event of an unplanned fire. The water supply for this system will be integrated into the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				design of each BESS container and located either internally or externally to each BESS. The containment of this water would be within a sump integrated into the BESS container; - Each BESS compound requires a maximum of 242.5m³ of water storage for use by fire fighters in case of an unplanned fire in the BESS compound. Water would either be stored two half capacity sectional steel panel tank or two half capacity cylindrical steel panel tanks; - Each BESS area would be lined with an impermeable surface to prevent water used during firefighting operations infiltrating into the soils underlying the BESS area. Each BESS area would also require a bunded lagoon capable of capturing 242.5m³ of fire water. The lagoon would have a volume of approximately 410m³, which would allow the water to be stored following an emergency event and removed from site if contaminated; and - The Scheme design will include adequate separation and firewalls between battery banks to ensure that an isolated fire would

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				not become widespread and lead to a major incident. In addition to the above, a Fire Emergency Response Plan and a Fire Service Site Specific Risk Assessment will be produced for each BESS area. This will be secured through the Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP), the implementation of which is secured via a requirement to the DCO. A fire risk assessment has been prepared to understand the potential impacts on surrounding sensitive receptors in the unlikely event of a fire within one of the three BESS areas. The Unplanned Atmospheric Emissions from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) provided in Appendix 16D of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] has determined that even in the unlikely scenario that all the safety systems fail and a large scale fire breaks out within one of the BESS containers then the resultant hydrogen fluoride concentration at the closest receptors would be below the level that Public Health England has identified as resulting in notable discomfort to members of the general population.
Human Health	Creating a battery management safety plan is insufficient reassurance.	Landowner	No	The Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (OBFSMP) has been created in order to evaluate, mitigate and be fully prepared for the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				risks associated with battery storage technology. The OBFSMP has been developed in consultation with the relevant county council teams and fire services authorities. Further details can be found in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [EN010106/APP/7.6]. A copy of the report has also been shared with the HSE and comments solicited. This document will be kept updated and its recommendations will be implemented ahead of construction and decommissioning and throughout the lifetime of the Scheme.
Human Health	What will radiated heat from the solar panels do to our local atmosphere?	Landowner	No	The impact on local temperature from PV module energy generation is considered to be negligible and has therefore not been assessed as part of the Applicant's environmental impact assessment activity. Full details of the results of the Applicant's assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm can be found in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Human Health	The electromagnetic field from the site could cause health problems.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has considered the impact of electromagnetic fields and consulted with Public Health England at the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping stage. The impact upon human health of these fields was scoped out of our Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and this approach was agreed by the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Planning Inspectorate at the initial scoping stage undertaken in 2019. This was because it was considered that the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm did not present any significant risk to human health through such fields. Public Health England did not raise a concern with this approach when consulted on the scoping report.
Noise	How will neighbours be compensated for the noise impacts?	Landowner	No	Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the CEMP, a Framework CEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant will develop a construction noise monitoring scheme as part of the Section 61 consent prior to the commencement of construction works. Noise impacts from construction works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. This is set out Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. As such, it is not anticipated that compensation will be triggered in relation to noise issues. During operation, a minor adverse (not significant) effect has been assessed for

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				properties close to Weirs Drove and Hythe Land (receptors R1 in Chapter 11 of the ES) due to potential for increased operational noise of the substation extension at Burwell NG Substation. Measures to mitigate noise and vibration effects from operational equipment are outlined in the Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) in Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. No further mitigation above the measures set out in the Framework OEMP are proposed.
Noise	How much noise will be created by the battery and inverters?	Landowner	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during both construction and operations. Where appropriate, the Applicant has proposed mitigation to limit the Scheme's noise impact. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Noise impacts of the solar plant (including the battery and inverters) during the operational lifetime are predicted to equate to a negligible to minor adverse effect, which is not considered significant.
Noise	Royal Worlington & Newmarket Golf Club shares a boundary with the site. We are keen that any development shouldn't have an	Landowner	No	The Royal Worlington and Newmarket Golf Club are nearest to the receptor location R12, which forms the location for monitoring and assessment for noise and vibration impacts on

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	adverse impact on this world-renowned golf course. We would like to know if any plant relating to the energy farm produces any noise pollution that would affect the right of quiet enjoyment.			Worlington. Noise impacts from construction, operation and decommissioning works are predicted to be negligible, and not significant. Vibration from works during construction and decommissioning, such as excavation or push piling, may be experienced by receptors around R12, however this has been assessed to be a minor adverse effect, and not significant. Vibration effects have been assessed to be negligible at receptor R12 during operation. This is discussed in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Precautionary working methods will be implemented to minimise potential adverse effects during construction across the entire Scheme. This is outlined in the Framework CEMP [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Construction noise levels will be controlled through the use of embedded mitigation and the use of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), a Framework CEMP has been submitted in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant will develop a construction noise monitoring scheme as part of the Section 61 consent prior to the commencement of construction works.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Noise	As Trustees we are further concerned that the noise pollution which will undoubtedly be generated by this development will affect the right of Quiet Enjoyment currently enjoyed alike by members of the Golf Club and visitors to the course, who come from far and wide, including overseas.	Landowner	No	Operational noise levels will be controlled using embedded mitigation as set out in the Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) in Appendix 16F of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.2]. Noise impacts of the solar plant during the operational lifetime are predicted to equate to a negligible to minor adverse effect, which is not considered significant. This is outlined in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [APP/010106/APP/6.1]. Where noise impacts are identified, the Applicant has embedded significant mitigation measures within the Scheme design.
Consultation	Didn't receive notification about the non-statutory consultation.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has identified land interests through a process of diligent inquiry. This has been repeated on a regular basis as the Applicant has refined its design in response to feedback received through the non-statutory consultation and the results of its assessments. This has resulted in the identification of additional land interests who may not have been consulted at the non-statutory consultation stage. During the statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted with all land interests that it had identified as required by section 44 of the Planning Act 2008. Further information on this is

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				provided in Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1).
Consultation	The NSIP process and lack of transparency in the statutory consultation process have made us feel like bystanders.	Landowner	No	The NSIP process is a fixed statutory process that requires us to consult with persons with a land interest which we have done through the statutory consultation and subsequent targeted consultation. During the statutory consultation we consulted, as required by the Planning Act 2008, and with the community as set out in the SoCC (Appendix D-2). We received a significant number of responses as demonstrated by Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1). The Applicant published a number of materials to facilitate the consultation including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included the preliminary results of the Applicant's environmental impact assessment activity. Subject to the Application being accepted for examination, there will be a further opportunity for interested parties to register and submit their feedback and be involved throughout the examination of the application.
Consultation	Difficult to comment as no confirmed information has been provided on cable route, dimensions of cables, depth and method of burial, number of	Landowner	No	The Applicant considers that it provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback to the consultation. This has included publishing a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	joints, type, cost and size of renovations at Burwell.			a comprehensive scheme description. This information was necessarily preliminary in nature as the Applicant's assessment activity was ongoing. As is established practice, the Applicant assessed the Scheme's impact according to Rochdale Envelope method of the maximum parameters or impact, meaning that a worst-case scenario for the impacts of the Scheme has been assessed in the PEI Report and the Environmental Statement. Further information on the Scheme is provided within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement (EN010106/APP/6.1). It is established practice that detailed design only be finalised after submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. Finalisation of the detailed design will be secured by a requirement in the DCO.
Consultation	A lot of the information you have provided is speculative. How can we comment most effectively on hypotheticals?	Landowner	No	The Applicant considers that it has provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback to the consultation. This has included publishing a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included a comprehensive scheme description. This information was necessarily preliminary in nature as the Applicant's assessment activity was ongoing. As is established practice, the Applicant assessed the Scheme's impact according to Rochdale Envelope method of the maximum

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				parameters or impact, meaning that a worst-case scenario for the impacts of the Scheme has been assessed in the PEI Report and the Environmental Statement. Further information on the Scheme is provided within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement (EN010106/APP/6.1). It is established practice that detailed design only be finalised after submission of the DCO Application. Finalisation of the detailed design will be secured by a Requirement in the DCO.
Consultation	Have not received replies to a number of emails requesting further information.	Landowner	No	The Applicant responded to a large volume of enquiries during the statutory consultation and where it could, responded to all the enquiries prior to the conclusion of the statutory consultation.
Consultation	The proposals have not taken into account feedback given to the non-statutory consultation.	Landowner	No	The Applicant further developed its proposals having had regard to feedback received during the non-statutory consultation. This included reducing the total area proposed for solar development, moving proposed solar sites further away from villages such as Freckenham and Worlington, and reducing the proposed height of the PV modules. Further information on the non-statutory consultation and the Applicant's response to the feedback received can be found in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	Insufficient detail has been provided to enable comment on the Scheme.	Landowner	No	The Applicant considers that it has provided sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback to the consultation. This has included publishing a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) which included a comprehensive scheme description. This information was necessarily preliminary in nature as the Applicant's assessment activity was ongoing. As is established practice, the Applicant assessed the Scheme's impact according to Rochdale Envelope method of the maximum parameters or impact, meaning that a worst-case scenario for the impacts of the Scheme has been assessed in the PEI Report and the Environmental Statement. Further information about the Scheme is provided within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the Environmental Statement (EN010106/APP/6.1). It is established practice that detailed design only be finalised after submission of the DCO Application. Finalisation of the detailed design will be secured by a requirement in the DCO.
Consultation	More information should be provided about the feedback received from the non-statutory consultation and details of the feedback received from the statutory consultation should be	Landowner	No	The Applicant further developed its proposals having had regard to feedback received during the non-statutory consultation. This included reducing the total area proposed for solar development, moving proposed solar sites further away from villages such as Freckenham and Worlington, and reducing the proposed

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	provided before the DCO application is submitted.			height of the PV modules. Further information on the non-statutory consultation and the Applicant's response to the feedback received can be found in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1).
Consultation	The consultation has been poor with one-way webinars which lack detail.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has consulted in line with the methods set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (Appendix D-2), which included webinars, a virtual exhibition and telephone calls on request. The Applicant does not consider this to be 'one-way'. The Applicant considers that it published materials of sufficient detail to enable consultees to give informed feedback on its proposals. Further information can be found in the Consultation Report (EN010106/APP/5.1), including the consultation booklet (Appendix G-4), virtual exhibition boards (Appendix G-4), consultation questionnaire (Appendix G-2) and the Statement of Community Consultation (Appendix D-2).
Transport	Would roads need to be closed while the cable is being laid?	Landowner	No	Yes, temporary closure of roads would be required for a number of the local roads along the cable corridor. Road closures are anticipated to be no longer than 1 week in duration and the associated impacts have been assessed within Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Measures to control the effects during construction have been included in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport	How do you propose to mitigate the noise and disruption of 841 vehicles and 160 HGV movements per day?	Landowner	No	The Applicant has conducted a noise assessment to assess the Scheme's noise impact during construction. The results of these assessments and the mitigation proposed are set out in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] with measures to control noise during construction contained within the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The measures to control disruption to the local network as a result of construction traffic has been presented in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport	The cable crosses the Broads Road, goes under the Lode waterway and then crosses First Drove. Please tell me any inconvenience this will cause to access the end of First Drove and further how you may mitigate the inconvenience if any.	Landowner	No	The cable will cross the Lode using non-intrusive techniques such as boring, micro-tunnelling or moling to reduce potential impacts on the waterbody. It is likely that both Broads Road and First Drove will also be crossed using non-intrusive methods; however, this will be determined during detailed design. Should the two roads require closure, this is anticipated to be no longer than 1 week in duration. The measures to control disruption to the local

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				network as a result of construction traffic has been presented in the Framework CTMP and TP in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport	No sensible plan has been provided to mitigate volumes of traffic.	Landowner	No	The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed with Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CTMP and TP in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed during construction.
Transport	We believe that Golf Links Road will come under severe pressure if a voluminous quantity of construction traffic attempts to pass up and down what is a confined and narrow roadway in a rural setting both during the long construction phases and thereafter during maintenance. This will - in addition to the increase in noise levels - lead to greater danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users,	Landowner	No	The feedback from statutory consultation has been considered and the suitability of Golf Links Road for HGVs has been looked into further. Golf Links Road is no longer proposed as an access route for HGVs. The access point on Golf Links Road (J, shown on Figure 3-13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will be retained as used as an access point for staff during operation, but will not be used during construction. Rather than using Golf Links Road, HGVs will exit the A11 at the junction with Newmarket Road and will turn into Sunnica East Site B at access point I (shown on Figure 3-13 of the ES

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	including horses. Furthermore, the use of the road by e.g. heavy articulated lorries passing other road users will result in trespass on the verges flanking the road, parts of which verges are owned by the Golf Club. In short, this land will be damaged and part of the playing area of the course compromised.			[EN010106/APP/6.3]) before the turning to Golf Links Road. The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed with Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan (TP) in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed across the Order limits to ensure safety for all road users. The assessment presented in Chapter 13 has concluded that there would be no significant adverse effects during construction on Golf Links Road. A minor adverse (not significant) effect has been assessed for vehicle users in terms of accidents and safety around Sunnica East Sites A and B accesses, due to the number of accidents currently recorded on the roads in the vicinity of these Sites as part of the baseline. The socio-economics and human health assessments in Chapter 12 and 15 respectively of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1] conclude that there will be no significant effects on non-

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				motorised users of roads in the vicinity of the Sites during construction and operation. During operation, there will be an estimated 11 staff vehicles travelling to and from the Site (based on an estimated 17 permanent members of staff). This is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse effects to motorised or non-motorised road users.
Transport	La Hogue Road is a very small, narrow service road, totally unsuited to heavy traffic on a daily basis, which is what would happen, should this inappropriate scheme proceed. The site would be immediately opposite the main entry to La Hogue Farm, a working farm, as well as to La Hogue Hall and the Farm Shop and Cafe, which generates its own free flowing traffic, of customers and deliveries.	Landowner	No	The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed within Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CTMP and TP presented in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed across the Order limits during the construction phase. The assessment presented in Chapter 13 has concluded that there would be no significant adverse effects during construction on La Hogue Road. During operation, there will be an estimated 11 staff vehicles travelling to and from the entire Site (based on an estimated 17 permanent members of staff). This is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				effects to motorised or non-motorised road users.
Transport	We ask for confirmation that Golf Links Road will not be used for construction traffic or commercial maintenance vehicles thereafter.	Landowner	No	The feedback from statutory consultation has been considered and the suitability of Golf Links Road for HGVs has been looked into further. Golf Links Road is no longer proposed as an access route for HGVs. The access point on Golf Links Road (J, shown on Figure 3-13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) will be retained as used as an access point for staff during operation, but will not be used during construction. Rather than using Golf Links Road, HGVs will exit the A11 at the junction with Newmarket Road and will turn into Sunnica East Site B at access point I (shown on Figure 3-13 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) before the turning to Golf Links Road. The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed with Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Travel Plan (TP) in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				and staff vehicles will be managed across the Order limits to ensure safety for all road users.
Transport	The benefit of the site being relatively spread out over a large area, will mean that so will the traffic.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has noted this comment and welcomes the feedback received. The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed within Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework CTMP and TP presented in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed across the Order limits during the construction phase.
Transport	Has anyone noticed the amount of building work going on either side of the A14?	Landowner	No	An assessment of cumulative impact has been undertaken by the Applicant. This includes details of all the planning applications that have been submitted or accepted within the proximity of the Scheme. The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted with the Applicant's DCO application includes details of potential inter and intra cumulative effects.
Construction	Please provide information about noise and light and light impacts in the vicinity of the Scheme during the construction period	Landowner	No	The Applicant recognises that construction can be disruptive and will adopt the Considerate Constructors Scheme to assist in reducing pollution and nuisance from the Scheme. The

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	and when these will be the most intense.			Applicant will employ best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. The Applicant has included a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010106/APP/6.2] and Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan [EN010106/APP/6.2] to manage potential impacts during construction. Impacts on noise and light impacts have been assessed with Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Construction	Traffic problems will be created during construction.	Landowner	No	The forecast HGVs and staff vehicles have been assessed with Chapter 13: Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and also within the Transport Assessment in Appendix 13B of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (CTMP and TP) presented in Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] identifies how the HGVs and staff vehicles will be managed. No significant effects from construction traffic have been identified.
Construction	The West Site A is very close to the Godolphin Racecourse Training grounds at Snailwell. The noise and constant activity	Landowner	No	The Applicant has attended a number of meetings with Godolphin and the Snailwell Gallops in order to understand their concerns and to agree on measures to minimise disruption

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	during construction phase could potentially cause the working horses to spook, putting the safety of the riders and the welfare of the horses at risk.			to the gallops. The Applicant has included a measure that states that construction works in proximity to the gallops will not commence until after 10:00am in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Construction	I object, in the strongest possible terms, to the plan to establish the Contractor's site, immediately opposite the drive to La Hogue Farm on La Hogue Road.	Landowner	No	The construction car parking location has been sited within Sunnica West A to minimise the disruption to the local road networks as far as possible, as construction will be able to use the strategic road network for the majority of their journey to the Order limits. Not having, or placing the construction car park in a different location, would have significant impacts on the local road network across the local area.
Construction	A planning condition ensuring that construction works in proximity of the gallops do not commence until after 10am could prevent disruption to Snailwell Gallops, but Godolphin want to be involved with the planning process as early as possible so our concerns could be relayed to the applicant to allow them to address our concerns, and	Landowner	No	The Applicant has attended a number of meetings with Godolphin and the Snailwell Gallops in order to understand their concerns and to agree on measures to minimise disruption to the gallops. The Applicant has included a measure that states that construction works in proximity to the gallops will not commence until after 10:00am in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	hopefully avoid the need for us to formally object to the scheme.			
Construction	Do not want cables under their land.	Landowner	No	The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) which the Applicant is bringing forward to meet the need for new sources of renewable energy. The Applicant has engaged with affected landowners and where possible has sought to conclude voluntary agreements with them. The Applicant recognises that not all landowners want cables under their land and where possible the design of the cable route has sought to minimise the number of affected landowners. Further details concerning the communication with affected landowners can be found in the Statement of Reasons, including the Schedule of Negotiations included as part of that document [EN010106/APP/4.1]. Further details surrounding the optioneering exercise undertaken regarding the cable route choice can be found within the Alternatives Analysis (Appendix 4A) that forms part of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Construction	What are the planned start and completion dates for the construction works at and near the Burwell sub-station?	Landowner	No	The construction works for the sub-station at Burwell are planned to start approximately 24 months ahead of the commissioning date and run for a duration of 24 months from their planned start. The earliest date that the Scheme

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				will be commissioned is Summer 2025. Further details of these planned timings can be found within the Grid Connection Statement [EN010106/APP/7.4]
Construction	The construction phase will generate significant pollution.	Landowner	No	Chapter 14: Air Quality of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] has shown that the impacts of construction on local air quality are not significant.
Construction	There will be significant disruption caused during construction.	Landowner	No	A Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]). This details mitigation measures that would be adopted during construction to minimise disruption and environmental impacts during construction. A full CEMP will be produced during detailed design and prior to construction. A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 13C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]), which details the traffic management measures to be adopted during construction to minimise impacts on the local road network. A Design and Access Statement has also been submitted as part of the DCO [EN010106/APP/7.3].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Can Sunnica guarantee that the site would be managed safely and securely by suitably qualified engineers and technicians. Would the Environment Agency be involved in checking this and if not them, who checks?	Landowner	No	The Applicant will manage the site safely and securely by adhering to all the relevant regulations. Details as to the operations and maintenance that are proposed for the Scheme including security information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. Operations will also be controlled by the Operational Environmental Management Plan that is approved pursuant to the DCO. The Environment Agency may be involved in assessing impacts where they relate to specific Environment Agency issues. It is not likely that the Environment Agency will be involved in routine checks.
Operations	Our property is used for stabling, exercise and management of horses- all of which could be adversely affected should the cable route impinge on the property.	Landowner	No	The cable route will be buried underground and as a result will not impinge on the stabling, exercise and management of horses once it has been installed. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN010106/APP/7.3]. During the installation of the cable route we will seek to minimise disruption to the local community by incorporating a series of measures as set out in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which can be found in Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	It has been suggested that maintenance of the site will necessitate 'cutting' the grass on two or three occasions each year. Will the operators refrain from so doing during the nesting seasons of birds? Alternatively, to use chemicals (e.g. glyphosate) will destroy the eco system and potentially endanger human life.	Landowner	No	The management of grasslands will utilise both grazing by sheep and mowing. Any cutting of the grass will be in line with appropriate legislation relating to nesting birds and aimed at benefitting biodiversity across the Scheme. An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO (Appendix 10I of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]) and is secured through the DCO.
Operations	Your brochure illustrates sheep cropping the undergrowth. Is this just marketing?	Landowner	No	No, the intention is for sheep to graze the new vegetation cover beneath the modules. This will occur once the new vegetation cover beneath the modules has established so that it is to be able to withstand grazing. Before then, the maintenance will be via mechanical means.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	At the first consultation meeting you suggested that sheep would be able to graze between the panels. Firstly, this is not wildlife, secondly there would be an extremely high risk of damage to the panels and lastly there would be insufficient growth of grass as most of it will be in the shade of the panels.	Landowner	No	The intention is to graze sheep beneath the modules and we consider that there will not be a risk to the modules, as these are set above ground level. There grazing would not occur until the vegetation cover beneath the modules had sufficiently established to be able to withstand grazing. Before then, maintenance will be via mechanical means.
Operations	The Scheme will cause confusion to birds.	Landowner	No	The Scheme will not cause confusion to birds. A full assessment of impacts to birds is presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. This assessment concludes no significant effects to birds.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Operations	Impact on Godolphin during the operating phase is concerning.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has considered the potential of the Sunnica Energy Farm to impact on Godolphin's operations and has engaged with representatives of Godolphin on multiple occasions. Through its assessments the Applicant does not consider that there will be an impact on Godolphin during its operating life. More details can be found in the Chapter 18: Summary of Environmental Effects within the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and further details of the communications with the landowners can be found within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].
Decommissioning	Please will you confirm that all the assurances you have given about dismantling and returning the land to its pre-existing condition will be made enforceable obligation in any DCO permission.	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008.
Decommissioning	Decommissioning is expensive.	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework DEMP has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented.
Decommissioning	The Scheme will only be replaced by a far less obtrusive and invasive form of electricity generation.	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.
Decommissioning	What will happen to all of the plastic?	Landowner	No	Prior to decommissioning, opportunities to minimise waste as far as possible will be explored. Possibilities to re-use or recycle materials will be explored before resorting to landfill options. There is a new industry emerging for recycling PV modules. This would be explored, in addition to any resale of any operational modules. Waste during the decommissioning phase will be dealt with as part of a Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), which will be produced prior to decommissioning, and in line with relevant legislation and guidance at that time. The Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO is required to include a resource management plan that includes details

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				of proposals to minimise the use of natural resources and unnecessary materials. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) is included in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Decommissioning	Who will actually decommission the site?	Landowner	No	The DCO consent will require the person with the benefit of the Order at the time of decommissioning to be responsible for the decommissioning of the Scheme and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				DEMP, and for the approved DEMF to be implemented. The requirement to decommission the Scheme and implement the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) would be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order.
Decommissioning	Who deals with decommissioning if the Scheme is sold on or the operator goes bust?	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The costs should be calculated by an independent third party and the funds should be deposited prior to the start of operations.	Landowner	No	The Applicant does not consider that there is a need for funds to be deposited as suggested. This is because the DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.
Decommissioning	The commitments by the Applicant must be supported by a bond that of the equivalent value that it will cost.	Landowner	No	The Applicant does not consider that there is a need for a bond. This is because the DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	Sunnica have failed to provide adequate assurances that the panels will be removed from our land at the end of the lease period. Our dependants will then have the burden of this disposal which will neither be easy or cheap and then to put the land back in to how it was will be an unimaginable burden.	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The Applicant has made no financial commitment to ensuring it is done safely and effectively.	Landowner	No	The Applicant does not consider a financial commitment is required with respect to decommissioning, as the DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO consent will require the return of the land to its existing use and a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will need to be prepared outlining how this will be achieved prior to decommissioning works commencing. A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. That requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	The landowners may very well be left with a BIG clean up job, before it can be returned to productive agricultural farmland again, if at all. My fear is that it will become permanent Light Industrial land.	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	There is no legally enforceable plan nor funding for the removal of the installation (solar panels and batteries) or reparation/restoration of the land at the end of 40-year period.	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented, and that requirement is also enforceable through the Planning Act 2008.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Decommissioning	What guarantee do we have that Sunnica Ltd, who have no previous experience in this field will honour the promises to minimise the site impact and clear up costs. When it appears that Sunnica Ltd is just fronting the planning application and is being backed by a large Spanish firm.	Landowner	No	The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented, that requirement is also enforceable via the Planning Act 2008.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Generally opposed to the Scheme.	Landowner	No	The Applicant accepts that not everyone is supportive of the Application. The Applicant has prepared its proposals having had regard to feedback received across both statutory and non-statutory consultations. This has meant that the Applicant's proposals have been shaped by feedback that it has received. Further information on the consultation undertaken and how feedback has been taken into account can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Application to answer a need for new sources of energy generation and has provided further details for this in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].
Other	Solar PV panels can be toxic.	Landowner	No	A fully functional PV module is not toxic and does not present a danger to its surrounding environs. The Applicant does however recognise the potential for PV modules to be damaged and to leak. For this reason, the Applicant will put in place an Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) to manage the site during its operating life. This will include a regime of regular checks to identify and fix any damage prior to their being any leaks from the modules. The Plan will also set out precautions to be followed during maintenance activities to minimise the risk of any leaks. The Applicant has prepared a draft version of this plan which can

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				be viewed in Appendix 16F: Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The approval and implementation of the final plan is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.
Other	Require plans to be provided at a larger resolution.	Landowner	No	The Applicant provided plans at larger sizes and resolutions on request during the statutory consultation. Further information can be found in the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Scheme could affect the value of my property and business.	Landowner	No	It is not the Applicant's experience that solar development impacts negatively upon the value of properties.
Other	A scheme this scale should have got the landowners on side first before forcing the issue and claiming access.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has been and continues to engage with all the parties with an interest in the land which will be affected. Where possible voluntary agreements have been reached with affected landowners. Further information can be found within the Statement of Reasons [EN010106/APP/4.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	My family and I live in a property close to this proposal and if this goes ahead, we will be forced to move due to the disruption that it will cause.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has prepared a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which can be found in chapter 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which has identified a series of mitigation actions to reduce the impact of the construction process on the local residential dwellings. The aim of this plan is to keep disturbance to a minimum. The implementation of the CEMP is secured via a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.
Other	The Applicant has no track record of delivering projects of this scale.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has a strong track record with consenting, constructing, operating and maintaining large-scale solar PV assets in the United Kingdom and internationally. This includes constructing one of the largest solar farms currently operational in the United Kingdom. The Development Consent Order (DCO) includes a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Applicant will be required to construct the Scheme following all the guidelines as set out in the CEMP. This provides assurance that the regulations will be followed irrespective of the track record of the Applicant. Further details of this can be found in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in Chapter 16C of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.2], the approval and implementation of which will be secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO.
Other	Endorse the consultation response made by Freckenham Parish Council.	Landowner	No	The Applicant notes the response received from Freckenham Parish Council and has responded to the issues raised within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Appendix J of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	There is no substantiated proof that property prices will be adversely affected by the scheme.	Landowner	No	It is not the Applicant's experience that solar development impacts negatively upon the value of properties.
Other	Who would want to shop and or eat in the Café at La Hogue when it is surrounded by solar panels, part of the appeal is to go somewhere rural and enjoy the countryside surely?	Landowner	Yes	The Applicant's assessments have found there are no community facilities or businesses that would likely experience a significant effect on their amenity during the construction or operation phase. These findings can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. They take into account the results of the air quality, noise, transport and visual assessments. As a result of Statutory Consultation and ongoing design, there will no longer be PV modules in the fields to the north of La Hogue Farm Shop and Cafe, as shown on the parameter plans (figures 3-1 and 3-2 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	The Scheme is very likely to adversely impact my business – having spoken to our customers they are very against the scheme and feel that the proximity of it to our premises would put them off coming to visit my shop. This would be seriously detrimental to my trade and could lead to job losses.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has prepared its proposals having had regard to responses received through the statutory consultation. In response the Applicant has amended the design to move Sunnica Energy Farm further away from settlements and businesses, including the one referred to in this response. Further information can be found in the Design and Access Statement [EN10106/APP/7.3].
Other	Support the consultation response made by Matt Hancock MP.	Landowner	No	The Applicant notes the response received from Matt Hancock MP and has responded to the issues raised within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Appendix J of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.2].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Other	Support the consultation response made by Lucy Frazer MP.	Landowner	No	The Applicant notes the response received from Lucy Frazer MP and has responded to the issues raised within Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1] and Appendix J of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.2].
Other	This Scheme will destroy a local business, La Hogue Farm Shop and Cafe. This small family run business, employs numerous local people and loyally serves the local community, especially during the recent Covid Pandemic. A number of local residents have threatened to boycott the Farm Shop and Cafe, should this scheme go ahead.	Landowner	Yes	The Applicant has carried out an assessment of the socio-economic effects of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm and does not consider that there will be a negative impact on jobs locally. Further information can be found in section 12.8 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]. Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, the Scheme design has been amended. W13 and 14 (as shown in Figure 4-4 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) have now been removed from the scheme and W15 has been reduced in size. Woodland planting has been designed along the edge of W15 to screen the views of modules from the future residents. Please refer to Figure 3-2 of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				[EN010106/APP/6.3]. This has reduced the anticipated effects of the scheme on La Hogue Farm Shop.
Other	There will need to be a full and proper consideration to the impact on Kennett 'Garden Village' and its residents. Project due to commence 2020/2021	Landowner	No	Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, the Scheme design has been amended. W16 (as shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) has now been removed and W15 has been reduced in size. Woodland planting has been designed along the edge of W15 to screen the views of modules from the future residents. Please refer to Figure 3-2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.3]. This has reduced the anticipated landscape and visual effects of the Scheme on residents within the future Kennett Garden Village. Kennett Garden Village has been shortlisted as a cumulative development and included in the cumulative assessments presented in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				technical chapters where relevant. Cumulative effects have been summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Other	We do not want any solar panels placed on our farm. This is our home and where we intend to live for the rest of our lives. We do not want our home blighted by unsightly panels with totally inadequate screening.	Landowner	No	The proposed Sunnica Energy Farm is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) which the Applicant is bringing forward to meet the need for new sources of renewable energy. The Applicant has engaged with affected landowners and where possible has sought to conclude voluntary agreements and to minimise the number of affected landowners. Further details concerning the communication with affected landowners can be found in the Statement of Reasons in particular the Schedule of Negotiations that forms part of that document [EN010106/APP/4.1]. The Applicant does not consider the proposed screening to be inadequate. The Applicant's proposals to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm have been designed

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				following a number of assessments and through engagement with relevant stakeholders including the local authorities. Further information on the Applicant's proposals for landscape and visual mitigation can be found in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Other	Consideration will need to be made as to the impact on residents of Kennett Garden Village, care home/sheltered housing and primary school with nursery.	Landowner	No	Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, the Scheme design has been amended. W16 (as shown in Figure 4-5 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.3]) has now been removed and W15 has been reduced in size. Woodland planting has been designed along the edge of W15 to screen the views of modules from the future residents. Please refer to Figure 3-2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010106/APP/6.3]. This has reduced the anticipated landscape and visual effects of the Scheme on residents within the future Kennett Garden Village. Kennett Garden Village has been shortlisted as a cumulative development and included in the cumulative assessments presented in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				technical chapters where relevant. Cumulative effects have been summarised in Chapter 17 of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Other	All local parishes and district councils are against the excessive development, with 90% of local residence saying that they have objections to this proposal.	Landowner	No	The Applicant accepts that not everyone is supportive of the Application. The Applicant has prepared its proposals having had regard to feedback received across both statutory and non-statutory consultations. This has meant that the Applicant's proposals have been shaped by feedback that it has received. Further information on how the feedback received has influenced the Scheme can be found in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1]. The Applicant is bringing forward the Application to answer a need for new sources of energy generation and has provided further details for this in the Statement of Need [EN010106/APP/7.1].

Appendix J-5: Regard had to comments in response to additional consultation under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008

Table J-5.1 below sets out responses to the additional statutory consultation summarised in Chapter 5 of the **Consultation Report [EN010106/5.1]** from consultees under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008 and the regard had to them by the Applicant. It should be read in conjunction with Chapter 5 and Section 6.6 of the **Consultation Report [EN010106/5.1]**.

Table J-5.1: Regard had to comments in response to additional consultation under s42(1)(d) of PA 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	The drawings of the sites are small scale and this makes it difficult to assess the likely impact on our property	Landowner	No	The Applicant has provided larger scale plans and further explanation as to why land is proposed for use within the Order limits on request to any consultees who have contacted the project team through the publicised communication channels.
Consultation	The maps should identify which Sunnica sites are which.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has provided clarification to any consultees on request, including by providing larger scale plans of the proposed Order limits. The Applicant has operated communication channels, including an email, freepost and freephone throughout the consultation process to provide clarification and assistance where requested..
Consultation	Not enough information has been provided on the mitigating proposals to enable comment.	Landowner	No	The Applicant believes that it provided sufficient information through the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) and its notification of s42 consultation to enable consultees to make informed comments on the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. Where consultees have made requests for

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				additional information to the Applicant, the Applicant has provided details where possible, and when it has not been able to has explained why not. The PEI Report includes information on the Applicant's proposed mitigation covering a number of areas including: landscape and visual impact, construction impacts, ecology and heritage. This has been updated following the statutory consultation with the Applicant's proposals as submitted set out in the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Consultation	The letter received offers insufficient information to be able to comment. The supporting diagrams are not of an appropriate scale and further details should be provided as to why my land is required and what impact that it might have on households and businesses. Reserve my right to comment until additional detail is provided.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has provided larger scale plans and explanations as to why land is proposed for use within the Order limits on request to any consultees who have contacted the project team through the publicised communication channels. The Applicant has assessed the impacts of its proposals and has presented the results in the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Consultation	Share drawing of works proposed for Mildenhall Road/Elms Road which forms part of our property.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has shared a copy of the requested plans with the consultee and provided additional detail of the works proposed for the area. Further information on the Applicant's proposed works in this area can be found in the Works Plans [EN010106/APP/2.3] and Land Plans [EN010106/APP/2.1].

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	There are no details of this within this documentation you have sent me of any note of it online. All there is, is a small red dot on the overview plan?	Landowner	No	The Applicant has undertaken targeted consultation with affected s42(1)(d) consultees as required by the Planning Act 2008 following changes to the Order limits. In notifying s42(1)(d) consultees of its targeted consultation, the Applicant considers that it has provided sufficient information to enable consultees to give informed feedback on the proposals. In addition to the plans provided to each consultee, the Applicant has provided a large volume of information through its website including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) and has also provided contact details for any enquiries. Where consultees have requested additional information through the publicised communication channels the Applicant has sought to provide it.
Consultation	How can send this out for any type of consultation without first contacting me, asking my permission to use the land, giving my exact detail of how much land you want and what you intend to do with the land?	Landowner	No	In notifying s42(1)(d) consultees of its targeted consultation, the Applicant considers that it has provided sufficient information to enable consultees to give informed feedback on the proposals. In addition to the plans provided to each consultee, the Applicant has provided a large volume of information through its website including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) and has also provided contact details for any enquiries. Where consultees have requested additional information through the publicised communication channels the Applicant has sought to provide it.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
Consultation	We have previously confirmed that none of their properties are affected, the small amendment to the Energy Farm does not change the response. I am sure Openreach will have to review and respond	Landowner	No	The Applicant notes this response.
Consultation	Despite numerous attempts to contact your organisation via the publicised communication routes, I have been unable to communicate directly.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has checked its records and was unable to find trace of the consultee's attempts to contact the project team. Where the consultee has contacted the project team using the publicised channels, the Applicant has responded and provided additional information. Further information with regard to how the Applicant has engaged with land interests is provided in chapters 4 and 5 of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].
Consultation	It is important to highlight that the letter received from you on the 16th of June 2021 is the first direct communications from your organisation detailing the impact on our property and life. This is contrary to the opening paragraph in your letter. As a result, the enclosed plans and documentation have left us feeling highly concerned. We are thankful that you have been required to submit additional communication to those considered	Landowner	No	The Applicant has undertaken targeted consultation with affected s42(1)(d) consultees as required by the Planning Act 2008 following changes to the Order limits. The Applicant has checked its records and has identified a number of occasions prior to 16 June 2021 where the consultee received letters containing information about the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm and inviting them to provide feedback as a s42(1)(d) consultee. Members of the project team have also spoken directly with the consultee and provided additional information as requested. Further information with regard to how the Applicant has engaged with land interests is provided in 4.3.5-

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	within paragraph 8 of your letter of even date.			4.3.21 and Chapter of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].
Consultation	Information was sent to me from Sunnica informing me that there may be a case for compulsory purchase of the property, or purchase of some land. However, it has not been specified what the land is needed for in the development and/or installation of the solar farm. Could you let me know what the projected plans for this site are?	Landowner	No	The Applicant has provided larger scale plans and further explanation as to why land is proposed for use within the Order limits on request to any consultees who have contacted the project team through the publicised communication channels.
Consultation	Provide evidence of any previous letters sent to our address.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has provided this information to the consultee. Further information on how the Applicant has engaged with land interests is provided in 4.3.5-4.3.21 and Chapter of the Consultation Report [EN010106/APP/5.1].
Operations	Unsure on length of operational lifetime in years. Would like details of start time, maintenance proposals and decommissioning date.	Landowner	No	If a Development Consent Order (DCO) were to be granted, it is expected construction will commence no earlier than 2023. The current expectation is that site preparation, construction and commissioning of the Scheme will take approximately 24 months. The DCO will require that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				that time. During the Scheme's operating life it would be maintained by a team based on site with regular visits from specialists to carry out any repairs as required. Management of the ecological mitigation would be carried out according to an Operational Environment Management Plan, which will be updated post-final design subject to the Applicant receiving development consent. The Applicant has submitted a Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan within Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has provided details of project timelines within Chapter 3: Scheme description of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1].
Operations	What would the temporary works comprise and how long would the temporary works be in place?	Landowner	No	The purpose of the works is to facilitate access to the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. The proposed works include the temporary removal of street furniture at this location. The temporary work will be required during the construction phase of the proposed Sunnica Energy Farm. The land in question would only required for access and egress of cranes for the duration of the whole construction phase. The land in question is all within the local highway and the consultee was contacted because they hold a subsoil interest in the land. The Applicant has provided this information to the consultee by email.
Operations	The expected impact of the change on the farming activity in the field.	Landowner	No	The Applicant consulted with the consultee because of a subsoil interest and all works would be within the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	For information, the field is currently used to grow asparagus.			local highway. The Applicant considers that there will be no impact on the farming activity within the fields adjacent to the roads.
EIA Process	Further consultation and canvassing have identified significant impacts to the wider environment. We would invite interest parties to engage to ensure uncompromising outcomes. We acknowledge your PEIR will be complimented by further studies, and we look forward to being in receipt of these findings.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has continued to carry out additional survey activity following the conclusion of the statutory consultation. The Applicant has produced an Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] as part of its Development Consent Order application which builds upon the work presented in the PEI Report. The Applicant has further revised the design of the Sunnica Energy Farm following the statutory consultation to reflect consultation feedback and the outcomes of further assessments. An updated project description is available in Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010106/APP/6.1]. All the Applicant's application documents will become available on the Planning Inspectorate's website following acceptance of the Application for examination. Interested parties will be able to comment upon the Application if it is accepted by the Secretary of State for examination (through its relevant representation) and subsequently during the course of the examination. This will allow ample opportunity for the Application to be scrutinised by the local community
Ecology	There is a tree protection order around our property, please confirm which trees are affected and what	Landowner	No	During the construction phase manoeuvring the crane from Mildenhall Road onto The Street may require the tree in the central island to be trimmed to

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	steps are being taken to re-plant the area following decommissioning.			ensure contact is not made. No further works are required and this would not impact any of the trees around the perimeter of the landowner's property.
Construction	Please submit details of the construction activity proposed for the area, which is an ancient area of excavation. There is up to 3 metres lower depth between the existing road levels and the bottom of the pit that you need.	Landowner	No	We are not proposing any construction works in this area, aside from the trimming of the tree in the central island.
Construction	If steel sheet piling is required for the road widening, please confirm the extent of this both in terms of length and height.	Landowner	No	The largest of the cranes we assessed can currently manoeuvre the right turn from Mildenhall Road onto The Street without any requirements for works in this area. As such, we are not proposing any works, such as road widening, in this area.
Transport	Full details of the proposals within the red line will need to be seen for the County Council to provide full comments. We would need to see the vehicle access on an OS base plan with visibility splays and all relevant arrangements, highway information including boundaries, to make sufficient assessment of the proposals. You will need to provide details of the current traffic levels and the impact of additional traffic	Landowner	No	The Applicant has provided details of the site accesses including visibility splays, swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has carried out a full assessment of the potential impact of the Scheme on the local highway network, providing data on non-motorised users and on the potential usage of alternative routes through displacement. Traffic survey data has been identified in the Transport Assessment. The results of these assessments and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	generated by the proposals, coupled with any proposed mitigation measures. Furthermore, we would wish to see how these individual sites relate to the construction traffic routes planned. We would expect these details to be included as part of an application.			the mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant are set out in Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment presented in Appendix 13B [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Transport	There is not enough detail in the image shared to make comment relating to the impact on highways. Highways would need to see the vehicle access on an OS Base with visibility splays and all relevant arrangements highway info including boundaries to make sufficient assessment of the proposals. Like other accesses off the highway you will need to provide details of the current traffic levels and the impact of additional traffic generated by the proposals, coupled with any proposed mitigation measures.	Landowner	No	The Applicant has provided details of the site accesses including visibility splays, swept path analysis and indicative junction layouts in Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2]. The Applicant has carried out a full assessment of the potential impact of the Scheme on the local highway network, providing data on non-motorised users and on the potential usage of alternative routes through displacement. Traffic survey data has been identified in the Transport Assessment. The results of these assessments and the mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant are set out in Chapter 13 Transport and Access of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] and the Transport Assessment presented in Appendix 13B [EN010106/APP/6.2].
Design	Having reviewed the additional consultation documents, National Grid has no further comments to	Landowner	No	The Applicant notes this response and has responded to previous comments made by National Grid within Appendix J- S42 stakeholder responses.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	those made in the letter dated 16th December 2020 regarding its electricity infrastructure.			
Human Health	Request for an enhanced report on health impacts on this living close to such infrastructure.	Landowner	No	The effect on human health and wellbeing are assessed in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1], The assessment found potential negative impacts on the amenity of some residents on Weirs Drove and Hythe Lane in Burwell, Cambridgeshire during both the construction/decommissioning, and the operational phases. During the construction and decommissioning phase, this is due to noise impacts arising from the presence of HGV movements. During the operational phase, this is due to noise impacts arising from operation of the Burwell Substation Extension. There are expected to be no other negative health impacts on residents of properties or users of community resources in the study area.
Cumulative effects	It is considered that there will be an unacceptable Cumulative Effect from multiple factors throughout the development. This will have significant impact on our property, lifestyle and health.	Landowner	No	The Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1] submitted with the Applicant's DCO application includes details of potential intra-cumulative effects in Chapter 17: Effect Interactions of the Environmental Statement.
Design	The consultation documents show a boundary change to the proposed	Landowner	Yes	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with National Grid and

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
	order limits in an area where National Grid Gas has a high pressure transmission pipeline. The transmission pipeline forms an essential part of the gas transmission network in England, Wales and Scotland: Feeder Main 3 Roudham Heath to Great Wilbraham Barton Mills to Burwell Our response dated 16th December 2020 provides further information including guidance and requirements for: •works over or in proximity to any gas pipeline and apparatus; •pipeline safety; and •requirements for Deeds of Consent for any easement crossings.			National Grid Gas. Through these discussions, the Applicant aims to conclude agreements with National Grid to ensure adequate provision for existing gas transmission infrastructure.
Other	We acknowledge that your intent is to 'minimise impact' (paragraph 4). The reality is that the development will significantly reduce the value of the property and indeed the quality of life to those residing or visiting. We will seek compensation for this.	Landowner	No	The Applicant acknowledges the value attached to people's homes. In the Applicant's experience solar farms do not reduce the value of properties located close to them. The Applicant does however acknowledge the potential for there to be impacts both during construction operation and decommissioning. For this reason, the Applicant is proposing mitigation measures during construction, such as through its proposed working hours and working practices, to minimise disruption to the local community. Further information can be found in the

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 16C of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.1]) submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application. Subject to the Applicant receiving development consent, this will be updated prior to the start of construction. The Applicant has also prepared a number of mitigation measures relating to operational impacts including planting to screen the scheme infrastructure and proposals to maintain the sites during their operating life. Further information relating to this can be found in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and the Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan which can be found in Appendix 10I and Appendix 16F of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] respectively. The Draft DCO [EN010106/APP/3.1] sets out a requirement that the Scheme is decommissioned after 40 years of operation, and that requirement will be enforceable through the Planning Act 2008 against the person with the benefit of the Order at that time. The DCO will also require the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP). A Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been prepared and is presented in Appendix 16E of the Environmental Statement [EN010106/APP/6.2] which provides the outline mitigation measures to be adhered to during decommissioning. The DCO

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s)	Change	The Applicant's response
				includes a requirement in Schedule 2 requiring the preparation and approval of the DEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, and for the approved DEMP to be implemented. Any development coming forward on the land after the decommissioning of the Scheme would be subject to its own planning consenting process.
Other	Consider these communications (dated 19th July 2021) as an official request for any data held in relation to myself	Landowner	No	The only personal information that Sunnica Ltd and its agents hold on the landowner is their names, correspondence address, title information publicly available via the Land Registry, and a record of correspondence as provided to the landowner. The Applicant has responded on this basis to the person who made the enquiry.
Other	Freedom of Information Request	Landowner	No	Sunnica Ltd is not a public authority and is not therefore subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Information relating to the ownership of Sunnica Ltd is publicly available through Companies House.
Other	Provide any calculations as to the potential impact cost to properties falling within the scheme.	Landowner	No	It is not the Applicant's experience that solar development impacts negatively upon the value of properties. The Applicant is not proposing to offer compensation for any change in property values.