

Suffolk County Council (20031377)

Comments on the Applicant's Deadline 5 (D5) Submissions

Sunnica Energy Farm (EN010106)

Deadline 6

30 January 2023

Preamble:

This document sets out the comments on the Applicant's Deadline 5 (D5) submissions by Suffolk County Council (SCC) and (in relation to landscape, trees and heritage matters) East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC). Suffolk County Council endorses the submissions made by West Suffolk Council (WSC) and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) at this deadline. The tables below set out the document in question that the Councils are commenting on, together with the relevant paragraph or reference number.

6.2 Appendix 10I Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Clean) - Rev: 02 [REP5-011]

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
General	N/A	<p>The Councils welcome the restructure of the OLEMP. However, the document is still not complete and does not address the Council's concerns as to whether it will be effective in delivering and securing a well-designed Green Infrastructure and successful embedding of the scheme into the landscape. Nor does the OLEMP address post-decommissioning management measures as put forward by SCC in REP4-143.</p> <p>There appear to be a number of typing and numbering errors in the OLEMP that require correction.</p> <p>The Councils fully support and agree with the comments made by WSC on the OLEMP.</p>
OLEMP delivery	2.1.4	Alternative measures would need to be agreed with the relevant LPA. This should be reflected in the text.
Impact Avoidance - Structures	4.1.9	<p>This should be strengthened by replacing 'taken into consideration' with 'implemented'. The reference in line 5 should be specific as to which DCO Requirement this will be pursuant to. It is presumed that this refers to Requirement 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. it would be helpful for some indication of the criteria for suitability of materials, either here or in the design principles (Appendix B of [REP3A-033]) b. an Environmental Colour Assessment (ECA) should be carried out using the Natural Colour System (NCS)
Hedgerows	4.2.9	Neither this document or the FCEMP [REP5-044] includes information about minimising working width, HDD or other measures to reduce hedge removal. This information should be provided.
	4.2.10	Principles of this protection should be set out in either the FCEMP or OLEMP.
	4.2.12	It would assist us if the Applicant could confirm that this equates to five plants per linear metre.
Trees and woodland	4.2.17	The applicant should clarify why they are confident that they are presenting the worst-case scenario for tree loss, if they have not surveyed all trees that are likely to be affected (see also comments on paragraph 4.2.21 of this document and 1.3.6 of PAMS). In the absence of full and complete tree surveys being available prior to a decision being made, this section should be consistent with the FCEMP (p16C-35): 'As part of discharging Requirement 6 of the draft DCO

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		updated tree surveys will be carried out for any areas where arboricultural impacts are likely and where no detailed survey information has been captured to date.'
	4.2.19	Proposals for species should be agreed with the relevant LPA. Replacement planting will need to comply with the relevant LPA policy such as ECDC policy SPD.NE8 which stipulates the numbers of trees require as replacement based on the diameter of the trees removed. The species planted need to be suitable for the location and take into consideration climate change which may make it more suitable to plant non-native species that can still provide a habitat opportunity.
	4.2.20	The term 'smaller trees' is imprecise, as this could be read to refer to characteristically small species; it would be more precise to say 'younger stock'.
	4.2.21	The principles and triggers for these measures should be defined here to be sufficiently secured.
	4.2.22	It is not clear that the effect of hedgerow removal on mitigation and visual effects has been assessed. It would be helpful for the Applicant to clarify.
	4.2.23	More than half of the trees that are like to require removal have not been accurately assessed. Of these, nearly two thirds are estimated to be of high or moderate quality. The Councils would still expect to see all trees that are likely to be affected to be fully surveyed prior to consent given. To be clear, this does not mean 100% of trees within the DCO area, but 100% of 'likely to be affected' trees.
	4.2.24	In line three, 'where possible' should be deleted. The works carried out within RPAs of trees that are to be retained will require a site-specific Arboricultural Method Statement, i.e. specific for the location on site and to the tree(s) in question, that details the special construction methods that will be used to retain the tree(s).
	4.2.26	It is welcome news that no veteran or ancient trees are to be removed. But it is not clear how the applicant can be certain of this when more than half of the trees likely to be affected by the scheme have not yet been fully assessed, yet of which two thirds are expected to be of high or moderate value.
	4.2.29 – 4.2.38	This section covers Nesting birds, Stone Curlew, Badgers, Reptiles and Amphibians but does not include Bats which of all species are protected and easily disturbed with most UK species of bat

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		roosting or breeding in trees. It would seem useful for them to be considered due to the extent of vegetation removals and site disturbances.
	Tables 2 and 3	It is not clear how these habitats will be replaced, how long it will take to reach the current functionality of the existing woodland ecosystem. It would be helpful to clarify where these replacement woodlands are, i.e. are they set out in the Environmental Masterplan? [REP5-054]
Green Infrastructure	5.1.2	It should be clear by now what habitat creation and landscaping is feasible. The words 'where feasible' should be deleted both to improve clarity and, as the paragraph continues to state, because the assessment of likely impacts and effects of the scheme relies on these measures.
Design Principles and Green Infrastructure Proposals	5.2	These design principles should be incorporated into the final version of Appendix B of 7.3 Design and Access Statement to ensure they are correctly secured by DCO Requirement 6. The current DAS [REP3A-033] includes a now-outdated reference to the OLEMP. Direct incorporation of these principles would provide much greater clarity for all involved in discharging Requirement 6.
	5.2.2	<p>a. Parcel E01: Additional indicative proposals for willow tree planting and rush pasture west of E01 are welcome; However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance/ buffer between Lee Brook and western boundary of E01 is understood to be 40m (see [REP3-019] p104), not 8m. Clarification is required on the width of the buffer /setback from Woodland north of E01 and E02. <p>c. E03: The Councils consider that the buffer should be sufficiently wide so that Lee Brook remains legible in the landscape. In fact, this would be an opportunity to enhance the legibility of Lee Brook in the landscape by planting of appropriate tree species along both sides of the brook, which could be a visual benefit of the scheme.</p> <p>Therefore, the Councils propose to increase the distance/ buffer between Lee Brook and western boundary of E03 to 40m (in line with E01) or at least to a minimum of 30m and to provide additional riparian planting (also see VP1).</p> <p>E03 requires woodland planting along the western/ north-western boundary to screen the scheme from views from the north-west.</p>

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		<p>d. E04: Mitigation should be enhanced. Depending on what type of structures are envisaged for E04 and on the design in E33, it should be considered whether views from the residential properties to The Ark and St Andrew's Church in Isleham could be retained. (see VP2C)</p> <p>e. E05: Some of the changes around E05 are positive, especially the introduction of a circular route around the parcel; however, the link towards Isleham should not have been removed. The treatment of the plane crash site is uninspired and lacks ambition for good place making and design (see NPS EN-1, 4.5.1 and 4.5.3, and NPPF paragraph 174 (b)). The Applicant should explain why the corridor between Beck Road and the parcel has been narrowed to 80m from the 110m shown in the Landscape Masterplan Figure 10-14B. [APP-210].</p> <p>f. ECO1: The Applicant should consider whether landscape measures are required to reduce disturbance of offsetting land by recreational users on the dismantled railway line. The Applicant should also consider whether a hedge should be planted to the east of this parcel along Beck Road to screen the road and new footpath from within ECO1.</p> <p>g. ECO2: The Applicant should further consider how the PRoW can be screened to reduce disturbance to Sone Curlew and to prevent trespass onto the offsetting land.</p> <p>h. E08, E09 and E10: The woodland north of E08 needs to be wider as views are far reaching towards BESS. Mitigation for E10 should be fine-tuned to suit the location. The Applicant should clarify what will happen to the existing hedge along the southern boundaries of E09 and E10 (shown as proposed hedgerow on Zoomed-In Environmental Masterplan, Sheet 4).</p> <p>j. ECO3: The Councils still consider that E12 should be removed from the scheme. No set back from the U6006 has been incorporated into the scheme. There are still two proposed crossing points, requiring the removal of TPO trees. The additional hedgerow along the eastern boundary of E12 would be an improvement in visual amenity for the users of U6006.</p> <p>k. E12-E17 None of the previously made requests for amendments have been incorporated. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain curves in U Road between E13 and E14.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional hedge along and adjacent to U Road corridor. Retain all existing vegetation. • Provide hedge along eastern boundary and along south-western boundary (along northern side of existing track) (see VP15B) of E13, (if parcel is not removed entirely). • Provide better screening in northern corner of E14 by planting up a triangular corner of sufficient size. • Divide E14 halfway across and provide further screen planting from south-west to north-east to reduce visual effects. • Along the boundary between E14 and E15 strengthen the existing pine line by planting additional pines. • Along eastern boundary of E14 repair and strengthen the pine lines. • It does seem appropriate to reinforce pine lines/tree belts along the western boundary of E14, E15 and E16 (for E16 also on southern edge) (see VP15B VP21, VP21A) But this will need to be sensitively done and woodland may be inappropriate. • Along the boundary between E14 and E15 strengthen the existing pine line by planting additional pines. • Along eastern boundary of E15 repair and strengthen the pine lines. • Strengthen existing tree belt between E15 and E16. • Create visual corridor north of this tree belt by using the existing track for access and screening the solar panels by planting up a sufficiently large triangular area in the western corner of E16. • Along eastern boundary of E16 repair and strengthen the pine lines. • Provide tree belt along north-western and southern boundary of E17 towards BESS in E18. (see VP16) <p>l. E19-E17: As previously requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does seem appropriate to reinforce pine lines/tree belts along the western boundary of E19. (VP21, VP21A) • Plant up the two triangular areas on the south-western side of the water reservoir and the DCO boundary.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The woodland on southern side of E20 is now legible on the Environmental Masterplan. • Strengthen internal hedgerows between E20 and E21 (see VP 20) and between E21 and E20. • On the eastern side of parcels E20-E22 increase buffer between fence and solar panels to 30m and provide tree belt with hedgerows on either side for amenity purposes. <p>m. E24-E25: Planting (hedges and pines) is also needed along western boundary.</p> <p>n. E26-E29: Provide hedge towards permissive footpath (along northern edge of parcels E26 and E27). Additional hedges should be included between the DCO limits and the track along the south of E28 and E29. (see VP22)</p> <p>o. Parcels E30-E32: The additional internal hedgerows as requested by the Councils have not been incorporated and the treatment of the corner into Golf Links Road (Mixed scrub with scattered trees) lacks vision and ambitions for positive place making. This corner would be pre-destined for one of the proposed random tree groups [see NPS EN-1, 4.5.1 and 4.5.3, and NPPF paragraph 174 (b)].</p> <p>Provide return hedge planting at access into E30, in north-western corner.</p> <p>Provide hedge between E30 and E31 and between E31 and E32. Provide internal hedge within E31 to break up expanse of solar panels. Additional hedges should be allowed along the western boundary of E30.</p>
	5.2.3	<p>a. Despite the design principles set out in the wider paragraph, the massing of the built structures within W17 remains a concern, not only in terms of cultural heritage, but also in more general landscape terms. In order to make W17 acceptable in landscape terms, a much more differentiated approach to integrating the proposals into the historic landscape would need to be presented. The current proposals for mitigation provide neither sufficient integration and screening nor are they sensitive enough to the local landscape character. It is not considered possible to make this parcel acceptable in regards to impact upon heritage.</p> <p>b. The set off from trees and hedgerows should be sufficiently wide, that future tree growth will not result in the need for tree reduction or removal for reasons of shading of the solar panels.</p>

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		c. The implementation of new woodland and hedgerows would need to be executed with great care to ensure that these measures would not detract from the existing, largely open, character of this historic and sensitive landscape.
	5.2.4	<p>a.- f. Parcels W03-W12: The Councils consider that the harm is too great and not capable of adequate mitigation and that these parcels should be removed from the scheme. Should the ExA be minded to retain these parcels, the Councils would like to comment in due course. Given that adequate mitigation would not be achievable (for the reasons set out in SCC's post-hearing submissions following ISH2 [REP4-124] under Agenda Item 4, point c), the Councils would consider that off-site compensatory measures would need to be identified and secured.</p> <p>g. Parcel W15: The offset from the watercourse needs to be clarified (it should be shown what width is proposed for the offset and where). Mitigation needs to be more robust. The OLEMP states that new woodland would be provided around the perimeter of the parcel. However, this is not what is shown on the Environmental Masterplan (Sheet 10). Proposed woodland/ tree belt should be extended along the southern boundary and other boundaries. Riparian planting should be provided along the boundary towards Lee Brook.</p>
General Design Principles	5.3.3	<p>c. Should be more specific about proportions of native species.</p> <p>d. The meaning of "diversity of provenances" should be explained.</p> <p>e. Species mixes should be much more defined by now.</p>
General principles for establishment maintenance	5.3.12	This will need to be agreed with relevant LPA.
General principles for long-term management	5.3.13	This will need to be agreed with relevant LPA.
	5.3.14	This will need to be agreed with relevant LPA.
Hedgerows	5.4.2	The document still does not differentiate between new and proposed infill hedgerow.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		Please explain the reduction from 7.5km (1.7.53 LEMP Rev 01, [REP3-013] to 5.5km (see also Table 32/ Table 3 of this document).
Hedgerow Objectives	5.4.3	Many hedgerows additionally have landscape screening functions. This should be mentioned here as a new point d.
Hedgerow Design Principles	5.4.4	e. is too vague; setting out should work around ultimate spread of hedgerows, not just consider it. The principles for this should be set out. These should include minimum distance of any new planting from the edge of any footpath and width of hedgerow corridor.
Hedgerow Outline Specification	5.4.9	Annex D is still too simplistic; it does not reflect the variation in sizes for plant stock referred to in the main body of the text and only relies on the smaller stock sizes; this requires amendment.
Hedgerow Establishment maintenance	5.4.10	b. The use of weedkillers needs to be specified more clearly and reflect standards and requirements of the relevant LPA; it needs to be agreed with the relevant LPA. g. The Applicant should provide a timeframe for replacement of failed or defective plants: e.g. how frequently will this take place?
Hedgerow Long term management	5.4.12	e. This should not become necessary with appropriate planning and design g. It is noted that there is no more talk about re-introducing native Elm to suitable location, only about natural colonisation. h. and i. Herbicide use needs to be better defined and agreed with relevant LPA.
	5.4.13	Given that the solar panels are 2.5m high should not all hedges be at least 3m tall?
Trees and woodland	5.5.1	Please explain the changes in figures from previous revision of LEMP (1.7.61, [REP3-013] which proposes the creation of 52ha of woodland, together with 17.7 ha retained woodland amounting to 70ha; now 44ha new woodland are proposed, 36ha retained woodland totalling 80ha; please explain these figures especially the increase in total woodland area and how it is now possible to more than double the woodland to be retained.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		Also, clarity should be provided for the 122% increase in woodland figure. The paragraph says nothing about woodland to be removed.
Trees and woodland Objectives	5.5.3	Most of the new woodlands and tree belts will have a visual screening objective which is not included.
Trees and woodland Design principles	5.5.4	e. The Councils are concerned that this principle creates a danger that woodlands will not be planted densely enough. f. This is unclearly worded. The solar panels should be located to avoid the potential for future shading, rather than the location of the panels being a constraint on the extent of woodland planting.
Trees and woodland Outline specification	5.5.7	This should be reflected in tables of Annex D.
	5.5.8	This should be reflected in tables of Annex D.
	5.5.9	Elm has been taken out of the planting mix; while it is correct that it cannot form a reliable part of compensation and mitigation planting, some re-introduction trials during the life-span of the scheme could be considered as a potential wider benefit.
Trees and woodland Long term management	5.5.15	e. i. 'early' should be defined in context of woodland thinning. f. Clarity should be provided on why it is necessary to wait until woodland is fully established, and after how many years is this considered to be.
Grassland habitat creation and management Establishment maintenance and long-term management	5.7.18	b. and c. This will need to be agreed with relevant LPA. d. is currently too vague. A currently-unspecified seed mix will need to be agreed with relevant LPA when details are available.
	5.7.20	The conservation sheep grazing is not fully thought through and now presented as an alternative to mowing, which would be the more likely outcome, with fewer environmental benefits. It is not clear that mowing has been assessed as a worst-case.
Other environmental features Integration	5.9.9	a. These additions are welcome in principle, however, the treatment of the plane crash site is uninspired and lacks ambition for good place making and design [see NPS EN-1, 4.5.1 and 4.5.3,

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
with existing public rights of way and creation of permissive paths		and NPPF paragraph 174 (b)]. A Footpath spur should also be taken as far along Beck Road as possible (i.e. fork at north-western end).
	5.9.11	Please replace 'south of' with 'around', as the route is now proposed to be circular.
Other environmental features Environmental fencing	5.9.13	This implies the fencing for the ECO areas will also be temporary, which does not line up with later paragraphs or the need for long-term protection. Specificity around the timeframe would be helpful.
	5.9.14	Please replace 'manage' with 'help avoiding' and insert 'to ecologically sensitive areas' at the end of the paragraph.
	5.9.15	a. and b. occur twice under the same paragraph number. Please renumber to aid referencing. It is not clear whether the objective for the timber fencing is to prevent Glint and Glare for road users and equestrians or for more general landscape screening purposes. This should be clarified. Design principles b.: How high will the stock proof fence be? c. please insert at the end: 'and provides effective screening.'
Post-construction Monitoring	6.1.2	Inspection reports should be issued to relevant LPA.
	6.1.4	This provision is insufficient: inspection should be annually for first five years (and for the first 10 years for trees), the year 7 and year 10. The frequency thereafter should be agreed with the relevant LPA based on the success of the establishment of the planting.
	6.1.5	The commitment to monitoring of Stone Curlew in the OLEMP is insufficient and is not consistent with the commitment in the Offsetting Habitat Provision Specification [REP5-047] section 4.1.40 which states that the 'The use of the Stone-curlew offsetting areas will be monitored annually for the lifetime of the Scheme, along with the population present within 500m of the Scheme'.
Roles and Responsibilities	6.2.1	The Councils welcome this clarification.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
Roles and Responsibilities: The Ecology Advisory Group	6.2.8	<p>No information is given on how the Ecology Advisory Group will be funded or the mechanisms through which the applicant intends to secure this group.</p> <p>The Councils propose that the Ecology Advisory Group should be formally constituted pursuant to a s106 agreement or equivalent planning obligation and are drafting proposals to share with the applicant.</p>

6.2 Appendix 13C Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan (Tracked) - Rev: 04 [REP5-016]

Topic	Paragraph Number	SCC's Comment
General	N/A	The majority of SCCs concerns raised in [REP4-141] remain although to assist the Examining Authority we note below where changes made to the CTMP have resolved the matters raised in our deadline 4 response. Additionally a small number of corrections are noted. Other matters remain unresolved.
Construction Movements	2.3.1	The amendment to address 7.5 tonne HGVs is welcomed.
Staff Movements	2.4.5	While it can be accepted that the removal of Sunnica West Site B does reduce overall traffic this does not material change any impacts on the highways adjacent to Sunnica East.
SCC Lorry Route Network	Table 3-1	This has been amended to remove the B1085 from the list of SCC Lorry Routes.
Site Accesses and HGV Routes	4.1.9	This list refers to Sunnica East Site A: Site Access K on Elms Road. On the plans this access is located on Beck Road (Figure 3).
	4.1.11	The Applicant states that for Sunnica East site accesses E and F: <i>'HGV vehicles routes are proposed to use Isleham Road to/from the A11 with the inbound and outbound routes shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7 respectively'</i> . Figures 6 and 7 show the route using the B1102 Freckenham Road Mildenhall Road and C603 Freckenham Road, not the C608 Isleham Road. It may be that Figures 6 and 7 may only be showing routes to grid connection T, but this is not clear as the plans only show accesses to the main site. Clarification is still required on the routing of HGVs on Isleham Road.

Topic	Paragraph Number	SCC's Comment
Crane and AIL Route Reviews	5.4.5	<p>A change has been made stating that 'the 46.63m AIL will have a transport weight of approximately 200 tonnes'. This would be a special-order movement, not STGO3. Table 2-2 is now incorrect.</p> <p>Further information on special categories can be found in the Special Types Enforcement Guide published by the Driver and Vehicle Standards Authority: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/special-types-enforcement-guide/special-types-enforcement-guide</p>
Burwell National Grid Substation Extension	5.8.1	The removal of Sunnica West Site B from the project means that cranes are no longer required to use the B1103 and thus the issue identified at Swan Lane with oversailing AILS being very close to the White Swan Public House and the 1000T crane traversing over the footway (paragraph 5.8.1) have been resolved.
Management Measures and Controls	7.2.38	The change of car occupancy to 1.5 to make this consistent with the remainder of the document is welcome. However, none of the other matters relating to controls, monitoring, reporting and enforcement in [REP4-114] have been addressed.

7.6 Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (Tracked) – Rev: 02 [REP5-051]

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
General	N/A	The Councils welcome the commitment to engage the services of an independent Fire Protection Engineer specialising in BESS to evaluate hazard modelling and risks, and encourage the Applicant to continue to engage with interested parties and continue to update the outline Battery Fire Safety Plan.

8.46 Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (Tracked) – Rev: 01 [REP5-053]


Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
General	N/A	It would be helpful if the trees referred to in the text were referenced to the nearest parcel for ease of locating them.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		It would be helpful if the Tree Survey Table was clearly structured into Trees, Groups and Hedges and also would reference these to the nearest parcel or cable route section or TPP sheet.
Detailed Tree Survey Findings	6.1.4	The importance of the avenue south of Chippenham Hall is not diminished by the change in species mix over time. It is still clearly present as a feature in the landscape and as part of the registered park and garden.
Summary of Arboricultural Impacts	7.3.6	<p>Please see comments on OLEMP paragraphs 4.2.17 and 4.2.23.</p> <p>It remains the case that 53% of all tree canopy cover to be removed has only been assessed via desk study and walkover review (where feasible), rather than by detailed tree survey. The Council is disappointed that a full tree survey has not been undertaken given the Councils request for this in response to the PEIR.</p> <p>It would be helpful if it could be explained why design changes have substantially reduced the relative percentage of surveyed trees to be removed.</p>
	7.3.9	The impacted TPO trees have now been assessed but still some inaccuracies remain, relating to the number of trees to be removed.
	7.3.10	<p>The AIA states in relation to TPO trees on the U6006 Road that 'The potential for these trees to be retained will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process and this is secured as a commitment in the FCEMP'. The Councils do not consider the wording in the FCEMP [REP5-044] to reflect this commitment. The FCEMP states 'The Arboricultural Report will also explain how impacts to the TPO trees identified as being impacted by the Arboricultural Impact Assessment have been minimised as far as reasonably practicable'. It would be helpful if the Applicant could identify what language secures this commitment.</p> <p>The Councils have specifically asked to retain the trees along Chippenham Road. As with the trees on the U6006, it is not considered that the commitment to minimise losses is adequately secured. It has not been justified why a crown lift to north and east to provide a clear height of 4m on T332 is required, and why an access in this location is required, when there is the cable route access not far, where trees already need to be removed (T335, T336, T337).</p>

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
	7.3.12	This statement is not accurate. FCEMP [REP5-044] page 16C-20 includes a statement that removal of trees in the Badlingham Lane CWS cannot be ruled out. The preceding discussion at 7.3.10 of this document implies that a number of trees in this area are to be lost.
Tree Works to Facilitate the Scheme	7.4.4	<p>Please explain: <i>'T227 (low quality) could be pollarded to 10-12m to address structural defects which would represent an unacceptable risk following the change in use of adjacent land. These works are justified to promote the long term survival of the tree but will be avoided and the area within falling distance of the tree will be protected as a fenced exclusion zone.'</i></p> <p>It is not clear to the councils that it would be sustainable to avoid undertaking the pruning works once the site is in use.</p> <p>Please indicate whether the tree, located within the hedge between parcels E20 and E21 is considered a veteran tree (table entry implies it but does not mention this explicitly).</p>
Incursions within the RPA or Canopy Spread	7.5.2	<p>Excavating 1m from a trees trunk would result in significant root loss. Any excavation must be located outside of the root protection areas as set via BS 5837:2012 which for the smallest size tree diameter of 75mm still provides a RPA diameter of 3m. Where excavations must be undertaken within this zone the use of mechanical excavation plant should be prohibited. Precautions should be undertaken to protect any exposed roots. Materials, plant and spoil should not be stored within this zone. The Local Authority Tree Officer must be consulted if in any doubt. The NJUG guidelines are from 2007 and in planning terms should be regarded as out of date and the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 followed instead.</p> <p>Services should be located outside of root protection areas or under them via directional drilling or similar. The location of the indicated cable route where it passes the end of the avenue as shown on tree protection & removal plans 6 and 7 appears to be aligned so as to make the directional drilling difficult to accomplish.</p>
The Future Impact of retained Trees	7.6.11	This is still vague; more assurance is needed. If the woody vegetation is a linear feature of a predominantly single species (as is common in agricultural sites) the shading could be significant or even total for some panels depending upon the orientation of the tree feature to the panels.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
		Therefore a plan needs to be in place for what will happen once panels become shaded whether that is that they are decommissioned or left to produce a reduced amount of energy. It must be made clear that none of the retained tree and none of the mitigatory planting will be lopped, topped or removed because of shading issues as they will likely outlive the temporary change of site usage. Any potential shading issues must be designed out now.
Summary and Conclusions	8.1.7	Map 6 on page 148 and the tree schedule page 125 appear to show three TPO trees to be removed from the TPO groups and not the two described here.
	8.1.11	With reference to Chippenham Road, it should be pointed out that the amenity of an individual tree is different to the amenity value of the avenue it is part of and should be considered as such.
Appendix B: Detailed Tree Survey Schedule		
Detailed Tree Survey Schedule	N/A	Veteran trees identified in the tree schedule as requiring ivy severance should only be given this treatment in conjunction with a bat and bird nesting assessment due to the very high habitat value of ivy and veteran trees and only if further assessment is required for safety reasons. A suitable exclusion zone should negate the need for this.
Appendix C: Precautionary Arboricultural Method Statement (PAMS)		
General	N/A	The detailed AMS will need to provide location-specific method statements for each area, where special construction methods are required, such as works in the vicinity or within RPAs. These should detail the challenges encountered and the methods employed to address them.
Order of Operations	1.2	The general principles are acceptable, however the DCO [REP4-006] allows the Applicant broad authority to conduct tree works without notification and consent of the relevant LPA of tree works. The Applicant should explain whether it considers itself bound by the PAMS in the context of articles 36 and 37 of the DCO.
Preliminary tree works and tree related impacts	1.3.8	The third sentence appears to contain a drafting error and needs to be reworded for clarity.
	1.3.9	Please specify the maximum time allowed to lapse between pre-clearance inspections and clearance.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
Scheme briefing for site personnel	1.4.3	It is not clear why there would be trees not covered by tree protection measures. A copy of the AMS should be in every site office, not just the main office.
Site Monitoring	1.5.2	These actions need to be approved by the relevant LPA. An LPA officer should be present, when correct installation of protective fencing is assessed. Reports about the safe retention of trees and any necessary arboricultural works should be issued to the relevant LPA. These reports need to include a time frame by when these works need to be carried out; the developer will need to adhere to this time frame. This is to keep all users and workers as well as property on site safe.
Installation of tree protection fencing	1.6.3	Insert 'with the relevant LPA' after 'agreed otherwise' and 'whichever is greater' at the end.
	1.6.4	This needs agreement from the relevant LPA and any damage also needs to be immediately reported to the relevant LPA.
	1.6.6	Any alternative fencing specification needs to be agreed in writing with the relevant LPA.
Earthworks	1.12.2	Additional tree works need to be approved in writing with the relevant LPA.
Diversion and installation of services (including cables) within RPAs	1.15.1	This should also be agreed in writing with the relevant LPA.
Trenching Techniques	1.17.2	The Applicant should make clear what happens if this is not possible. Otherwise an unqualified commitment would be preferred.
	1.17.6	At the end insert '... and these next steps must be agreed in writing with the relevant LPA.'
Dismantling of Tree Protection Areas	1.19	A post completion inspection ensuring the structural soundness of all retained trees must be carried out by Arboriculturist and a report submitted to the relevant LPA. If any works to the retained trees are required for safety reasons, these shall be detailed, with a time frame by when the contractor/ operator must carry these works out.
Appendix D: Tree Protection and Removal Plans		

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
Tree Protection and Removal Plans	All Sheets	Inspected category A trees are indicated on AIA plans in same colour as un-inspected ones, which makes it difficult to differentiate between them.
	Sheet 7	Amend access road and utilise access road of parcel W05 to minimise tree loss. The trees indicated to be lost at the south-western boundary of W07 (north-western corner) do not appear to have been accurately assessed.
	Sheet 8	<p>Shade pattern is marked more clearly than the previous revision, but some areas of concern remain such as the south western boundary of W08 as can be seen from the screen captures of the area from Google Maps and the submitted AIA plan.</p> <div data-bbox="840 584 1993 1090" data-label="Image">  </div> <p>The approximate length of the shade pattern is 29m as measured on Google Maps. These trees appear to be Lombardy poplars with significant future growth potential as they can grow to in excess of 30m in height leading to a shade area in excess of 30m.</p>
	Sheets 9 and 13	The cable route is marked on some AIA plans but not others (such as sheets 9 and 13). The Applicant should explain why.

8.47 Environmental Masterplan (Zoomed Out) [REP5-054]

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
General	N/A	<p>The Councils welcome that some requests have been incorporated into the new Environmental Masterplans. However, there are a number of elements that have still not been incorporated, such as existing PRoW, removed hedges, proposed drainage features, differentiation of different planting types, such as woodland/tree belts/pine lines. No justification for these omissions has been provided.</p> <p>In the majority of areas, the proposals have remained unchanged and insufficient. Detailed comments can be found in the Councils' Review of the OLEMP Rev 02 (see table above). The green infill for existing vegetation is blotchy, imprecise and difficult to read. This could have been used more usefully to show how the proposed planting links in with the wider Green Infrastructure, for example in the 'zoomed-out' Environmental Masterplans.</p> <p>The Councils fully agree with and support the more detailed comments made by WSC at this deadline.</p>

8.74 Second Change Application [REP5-059]

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
General	N/A	The Councils have no objection to the changes introduced.

8.76 Report on Current Status of Heritage Aspects of the RPG [REP5-060]

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
General	N/A	The additional document submitted has not altered the Councils' view on the harm to Chippenham Hall's Grade II Registered Park. It is first noted that in the Applicant has submitted Environmental Masterplan Detailed Plans Sheet 14 West Site A at Deadline 5 that still shows the removal of trees within the avenue of the Registered Park. Further concerns around the protection of the Registered Park is provided within Appendix 10I: Outline Landscape and

		<p>Ecology Management Plan Rev 2 that a detailed survey and impact upon all trees likely to be affected has not been carried out.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant seems to consider the avenue as fundamentally a driveway that leads to the Park rather than an integral part of the protected landscape. The avenue would have formed almost a ceremonial approach to Chippenham Hall and would have controlled views over the agricultural land beyond. This would have had no doubt been designed to project a sense of the power of those that lived within the Hall. Although the context is different, this is effectively the same relationship as The Mall leading to Buckingham Palace through the Registered Park of St James Park in London. The change from a formal avenue in agricultural setting, to the Registered Park being surrounded by an energy farm would entail significant, long term harm to the setting of this protected historic landscape.</p>
--	--	--

8.81 Public Rights of Way Closure Note [REP5-068]

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
Construction Methodology	2.1.1	This should include the survey of public rights of way prior to construction as part of the site preparation works and appropriate searches. The Councils refer to Cambridgeshire County Council's response to ExQ2 [REP5-079] Q2.9.11 for further information.
Temporary Closure of PRoWs and U6006	2.3.3	The Councils refer to Cambridgeshire County Council's response to ExQ2 [REP5-079] Q2.9.10., which states that the decision on closures should be carried out in consultation and agreement with the Local Highway Authority.
	2.3.4 b.	Appropriate signage should be agreed with the Local Highway Authority as advised in Cambridgeshire County Council's response to ExQ2 [REP5-079] Q2.9.10.
	2.3.4 c.	The Councils refer to Cambridgeshire County Council's response to ExQ2 [REP5-079] Q2.9.11., which states the CEMP needs to be amended to reflect the fact that PROW may not be closed but maybe affected by works. We request a condition survey will be undertaken of all PRoW affected by the scheme and the PRoW will be restored to their previous condition by the developer. Such reinstatement is to be inspected and certified by the local highway authority that is to their reasonable satisfaction.

Topic	Paragraph Number	The Councils' Comment
	2.3.4 e.	This should make clear that the construction workforce and visitors are aware of all non-motorised user routes or areas affected by the construction scheme. This should be wider than equestrian routes and cover all non-motorised users.
	2.3.4 f.	This is welcomed to enable clear communication for queries relating to monitoring and temporary closure of routes.