



# Mallard Pass

Solar Farm

## Mallard Pass Solar Farm

### Environmental Statement Volume 2 Appendix 10.3: Noise and Vibration - Consultation Summary

**November 2022**

PINS Ref: EN010127

Document Ref: EN010127/APP/6.2

Revision P0

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations  
2009 - Reg 5 (2) (a)

### **Appendix 10.3 - Consultation Record and Responses Relevant to Noise and Vibration**

- 1.1.1. Matters raised during consultation in relation to Noise and Vibration, as well as how and where matters have been addressed within the EIA and ES, are outlined in **Table 1**.

**Table 1: Key Matters Raised during Consultation in Relation to Noise and Vibration**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Date of Consultation</b>	<b>Main Matter Raised</b>	<b>How has this Matter been Addressed</b>	<b>Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES</b>
SKDC - Environmental Health Services	November 2021 – February 2022	<p>The proposed baseline noise survey methodology and locations were presented. SKDC queried the location of the potential noise-generating plant in relation to proposed survey locations and typical noise emission levels.</p> <p>Further discussion on approach to consideration of rated noise levels in accordance with BS 4142. Specifically, it was proposed to consider a lower limit of 35 dB for rated noise levels.</p>	<p>No adverse comments received on proposed approach at this stage.</p> <p>As noted below, section 42 consultation response from SKDC agreed with proposed approach.</p>	<p>Baseline characterisation outline in section <b>10.2</b> of <b>Chapter 10</b> [EN010127/APP/6.1] and <b>Appendix 10.4</b> [EN010127/APP/6.2].</p> <p>The approach to operational noise assessment is set out in <b>Appendix 10.2</b>.</p>
RCC - Public Protection Section	December 2021- January 2022	The proposed baseline noise survey methodology and locations were reviewed by RCC and considered comprehensive and satisfactory.	Survey was undertaken on the basis of the proposed approach.	See section <b>10.2</b> of <b>Chapter 10</b> and <b>Appendix 10.4</b> .
Planning Inspectorate (PINS) - Scoping Opinion	March 2022	PINS disagreed that noise effects of construction traffic could be scoped out in absence of information on potential movements volumes in	Assessment scoped back in and included in PEIR and ES.	See ES <b>Chapter 10</b> , <b>section 10.4</b> , with traffic assumption and

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Main Matter Raised	How has this Matter been Addressed	Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES
		relation to relevant thresholds for further assessment.		modelling detailed in <b>Appendix 10.5</b> .
Planning Inspectorate (PINS) - Scoping Opinion	March 2022	PINS agreed that noise effects of operational traffic could be scoped out but requested that trip generation should be confirmed.	Estimated trip generation is set out in ES.	See ES <b>Chapter 9: Traffic and transport</b> .
Planning Inspectorate (PINS) - Scoping Opinion	March 2022	PINS noted potential effect of Covid-19 pandemic on road traffic levels and whether the 2021 baseline data should be considered representative: this should be discussed with relevant consultation bodies.	This was discussed as part of consultation with local authorities: see below.	See below in same table for consultation and <b>Appendix 10.4</b> for further discussion of this aspect of the survey.
Planning Inspectorate (PINS) - Scoping Opinion	March 2022	The noise assessment should consider the potential emissions of solar tracker panels (SAT).	This was modelled and considered as part of the assessment.	Chapter 10 and Appendix 10.5.
Greatford PC – scoping opinion	March 2022	Consultee raised potential noise-sensitive receptors: stressing those along construction access route and querying completeness of receptor list provided in scoping report.	Construction traffic noise assessment considers all receptors along route. It has been clarified that the assessment of noise effects considers a	See Chapter 10, <b>section 10.2</b> for clarification. Receptors are shown in <b>Figure 10.1</b> .

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Main Matter Raised	How has this Matter been Addressed	Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES
			representative (rather than exhaustive) list of receptors.	
Greatford PC – scoping opinion	March 2022	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) [Ref 10-8] notes that tranquil areas which are prized for their recreational and amenity value should be identified and protected. This includes part of the Order limits and PRowWs.	The area was not designated as a protected tranquil area by the statutory consultees and, although rural in character, is currently affected by several anthropogenic noise sources. Stringent noise criteria are applied at noise-sensitive receptors in the area representative of residential amenity areas. The level of noise emitted during operation will remain low overall in the context of noise experienced across the UK. Potential impacts on PRowW are considered in the assessment.	The effects are assessed in <b>section 10.4 of Chapter 10</b> . See also review of NPPF guidance in <b>Appendix 10.1</b> .
Greatford PC – scoping opinion	March 2022	Concern regarding proposed baseline survey being sufficiently representative of local conditions and effects of wind etc.	Baseline noise measurements were undertaken in line with guidance in BS 4142 and in consultation with the relevant local authorities and is considered representative for the purpose of this study.	See <b>section 10.2 of Chapter 10</b> and <b>Appendix 10.4</b> .

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Main Matter Raised	How has this Matter been Addressed	Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES
Greatford PC – scoping opinion	March 2022	Concern raised regarding construction vibration impacts on residential properties and their foundations.	The criteria considered for disturbance associated with construction vibration are more stringent than those potentially associated with building damage, and therefore this type of damage is highly unlikely based on the proposed activities and mitigation.	See review of construction vibration impacts in <b>Appendix 10.2</b> .
Greatford PC – scoping opinion	March 2022	Suggest that a final design plan based on applicable noise limits should be defined at early stage rather than as a requirement of the DCO.	As the technology and equipment to be used is not finalised at this stage, controlling final noise emissions through a DCO requirement represents a suitable way of controlling the final site specifications. Predictions for a representative site design are set out in ES.	See section 10.4 of Chapter 10 and Appendix 10.5 for assessment of relevant effects, and proposed control in <b>section 10.5</b> of Chapter 10.
Greatford PC – scoping opinion	March 2022	Concern regarding impact of noise from construction traffic being scoped out.	This was scoped into the EIA, see above.	See <b>Chapter 10 section 10.4</b> and <b>Appendix 10.5</b> .
Lincs County Council – scoping opinion	March 2022	Operational, construction and decommissioning noise should be	A background noise survey was undertaken to support the assessment. Construction and decommissioning	See <b>Chapter 10 section 10.4</b> and <b>Appendix 10.4</b> .

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Main Matter Raised	How has this Matter been Addressed	Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES
		scoped in and a baseline noise survey undertaken.	noise and vibration impacts are scoped in, as well as operational noise impacts from plant.	
Rutland CC – scoping opinion	March 2022	Suggest noise monitoring should include construction traffic route.  Baseline noise survey in early 2022 may have been affected by Covid-19 restrictions.	The assessment of the effects of construction traffic is undertaken in terms of relative change in traffic noise levels for receptors located along the route, in line with applicable guidance documents. There is therefore no need for specific baseline noise measurements for these receptors.  As discussed in consultation with local authorities, if traffic levels were marginally lower than the long-term average during the baseline survey, this would result in a more precautionary assessment.	Relevant guidance for assessment of traffic impacts is reviewed in <b>Appendix 10.1</b> with the methodology set out in <b>Appendix 10.2</b> .  Appendix 10.4 considers the impact of Covid19 restrictions on the survey.
SKDC - scoping opinion	March 2022	Suggest noise monitoring should include construction traffic route.	See above response in relation to construction traffic route baseline.  The assessment of construction traffic was scoped in. In addition,	See <b>section 10.4 of Chapter 10</b> for assessment of traffic

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Main Matter Raised	How has this Matter been Addressed	Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES
		<p>Baseline noise survey in early 2022 may have been affected by Covid-19 restrictions.</p> <p>Traffic during construction and decommission should be considered.</p> <p>Welcomes engagement with SKDC environmental protection team.</p>	<p>decommission noise effects were also assessed.</p> <p>The relevant consultation with SKDC environmental protection team is detailed in this table.</p>	and decommission noise.
SKDC Environmental Health – Section 42 consultation (based on PEIR)	July 2022	PEIR assessment was reviewed and summarised. SKDC Environmental Health were satisfied with the assessment undertaken and the proposed control and mitigation measures.	Comparable approach retained in the ES.	See methodology described in <b>Appendix 10.2</b> and assessment of effects in <b>section 10.4</b> of <b>Chapter 10</b> .
Barton Willmore on behalf of RCC and SKDC– Section 42 consultation (review of PEIR)	July 2022	No comments on Chapter 10 of PEIR (Noise and Vibration) – approach to assessment in accordance with best practice.	Similar approach retained.	See methodology described in <b>Appendix 10.2</b> and assessment of effects in <b>section 10.4</b> of <b>Chapter 10</b> .

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Main Matter Raised	How has this Matter been Addressed	Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES
LCC – Section 42 consultation (based on PEIR)	July 2022	LCC does not have an in-house noise specialist and recommends and endorses any recommendations or comments made by South Kesteven District Council and Rutland County Council.	See above.	Not applicable.
Mallard Pass Action Group – Section 42 consultation (based on PEIR)	July 2022	<p>Noise is a concern for many residents for different reasons. The impact on people's mental health and well-being should not be underestimated. Difference between transitory and constant noise sources should be taken into account.</p> <p>Traffic noise on local roads, whilst transitory, could be very intrusive if levels are very high.</p> <p>Noise from the Onsite Substation could be tonal and noticeable by some residents in Essendine during quieter times of day or at night which could be very distressing.</p>	<p>A detailed and robust noise assessment forms part of the ES, including construction traffic and all proposed sources of noise from solar PV sources or those at the Onsite Substation. This takes into account the nature of the noise sources associated with the Proposed Development. Potential impacts on PRow users have also specifically been considered.</p> <p>Noise from electrical plant on PRowS is not expected to be at high level (below 55 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub>) and is relatively constant in nature so significant disturbance for animals such as horses is considered unlikely.</p>	See assessment of effects in <b>section 10.4 of Chapter 10.</b>

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Main Matter Raised	How has this Matter been Addressed	Where is the Matter Addressed in the ES
		<p>Concern raised regarding noise from inverter and tracker panels disturbing for residents and PRow's, taking account of wind levels in certain areas.</p> <p>Horses could be spooked by unusual noise from inverters in addition to other factors.</p>	<p>Wind interacting with fixed structures including solar panels is not expected to generate noise likely to disturb neighbouring residents.</p>	

