



EAST PARK ENERGY

East Park Energy

EN010141

Statement of Common Ground (Draft)

Huntingdonshire District Council

Document Reference: EN010141/DR/8.14

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009: Regulation 5(2)(q)

July 2026
Version P02

EAST PARK ENERGY

Planning Act 2008

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

Statement of Common Ground (Draft)

between the Applicant

and

Huntingdonshire District Council

APFP Regulation Reference:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	EN010141
Application Document Number:	EN010141/DR/8.14
Author:	BSSL Cambsbed 1 Ltd / Huntingdonshire District Council

Version	Date	Status
P01	April 2026	Deadline 2
P02	July 2026	Deadline 5

© AXIS P.E.D. Ltd 2025. All rights reserved.

This document and its accompanying documents contain information which is confidential and is intended only for the use of the client. If you are not one of the intended recipients any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken in reliance on the contents of the information is strictly prohibited.

Unless expressly agreed, any reproduction of material from this document must be requested and authorised in writing from AXIS P.E.D. Ltd. Authorised reproduction of material must include all copyright and proprietary notices in the same form and manner as the original and must not be modified in any way. Acknowledgement of the source of the material must also be included in all references.

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	2
1.1	Purpose of this Document	2
1.2	The Scheme	2
1.3	The Site	3
1.4	Status of the dSoCG	3
1.5	Structure of the dSoCG	4
2.0	Role of Huntingdonshire District Council in DCO Process and Summary of Consultation	5
2.1	Role of Huntingdonshire District Council	5
2.2	Summary of Consultation Undertaken.....	5
3.0	Matters of Agreement and Disagreement.....	7
3.1	Introduction.....	7
	Appendix A.....	27

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This is a draft Statement of Common Ground (“dSoCG”) made between the following parties:

BSSL Cambsbed 1 Ltd (hereafter referred to as the ‘Applicant’)

and

Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC)

- 1.1.1 The purpose and scope of this SoCG is to identify areas of agreement, areas under discussion and, as appropriate, areas of disagreement, between the parties in respect of the assessment of the Applicant’s proposals.

1.2 The Scheme

- 1.2.1 The Scheme comprises a new ground-mounted solar photovoltaic energy generating station and an associated on-site battery energy storage system (BESS) on land to the north-west of St Neots. The Scheme also includes the associated infrastructure for connection to the national grid at the Eaton Socon National Grid Substation.
- 1.2.2 Subject to the Scheme securing Development Consent in Winter 2026/27 it is anticipated that works would start on site in early 2028 and be completed by mid-to late 2030 (although initial energisation of the Scheme is likely to commence prior to 2030). The Scheme comprises a temporary development with an operational phase of 40 years; decommissioning activities would therefore likely commence in 2070, 40 years after commissioning, lasting for a period of up to approximately 2 years.

1.3 The Site

- 1.3.1 The Scheme is located to the north-west of the town of St Neots, and is across two administrative areas; Bedford Borough Council (BBC) (a unitary authority) and Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) (a two-tier authority with Cambridgeshire County Council) (the Site). The Site location is shown on **ES Vol 3 Figure 1-1: Site Location [APP-120]**. The Site area extends to approximately 773 hectares (ha).
- 1.3.2 With reference to **ES Vol 3 Figure 1-2: Site References [APP-120]**, for ease of reference the Order Limits have been sub-divided into East Park Sites A to D, in which all of the above ground infrastructure proposed as part of the operational Scheme would be located (excluding works to the Eaton Socon Substation). Sites C and D are located in the Huntingdonshire District Council area. The Order Limits also cover land outside of East Park Sites A to D which will be required for access, cabling, and the grid connection to the Eaton Socon Substation.
- 1.3.3 With reference to **ES Vol 3 Figure 1-2: Site References [APP-120]**, there are three linear corridors proposed for underground cabling that connect the different parts of the Site and provide a grid connection to the Eaton Socon Substation.

1.4 Status of the dSoCG

- 1.4.1 This dSoCG is a 'live' document that will be updated and amended as the Examination progresses. It identifies those aspects, matters and issues relating to the Scheme that have been agreed between the parties, those under discussion, together with those not agreed. The following definitions are provided for Matters Agreed, Under Discussion, or Not Agreed:
- **Matter Agreed** – means that agreement on the point recorded in the dSoCG has been reached, having regard to the information available at the date of that version of the document. No further discussion on that matter is considered necessary unless new information, amendments to

the Application, or other material changes arise. Agreement on a particular matter does not, of itself, indicate that the Council supports the Application overall.

- **Under Discussion** – means the Applicant and the Council have not yet reached agreement on the point recorded in the SoCG, but discussions remain ongoing with a view to resolving the matter, clarifying the parties' respective positions, or narrowing the extent of any disagreement. Further information, drafting, evidence or engagement may be required before the matter can move to 'Matter Agreed' or 'Not Agreed'.
- **Not Agreed** – means the Applicant and the Council have reached a clear and settled difference in position such that the matter is not capable of agreement. In these circumstances, further discussion is not expected to resolve the issue.

1.4.2 It is intended that the final SoCG will be finalised and signed by the Applicant and Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) as requested by the Examining Authority during the Examination of the submitted application.

1.5 Structure of the dSoCG

1.5.1 This dSoCG is structured as follows:

- Section 2.0 – provides a summary of consultation undertaken with HDC; and
- Section 3.0 – sets out whether matters are 'agreed', 'under discussion', or 'not agreed'.

1.5.2 A signing sheet between the Applicant and HDC is provided at Appendix A to be signed on final agreement.

2.0 ROLE OF HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL IN DCO PROCESS AND SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION

2.1 Role of Huntingdonshire District Council

- 2.1.1 HDC is one of three local planning authorities for the area within which the Scheme is located and is a prescribed consultee under Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended).
- 2.1.2 HDC is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the development plan for its area and for providing local planning, environmental and technical input to the Examination of the application, including through the submission of a Local Impact Report under section 60 of the Planning Act 2008.
- 2.1.3 Subject to the grant of development consent HDC will be one of the local planning authorities responsible for the approval of applications made pursuant to the requirements set out in Schedule 2 of the DCO, and for monitoring and taking appropriate enforcement action in respect of compliance with those requirements within its administrative area.

2.2 Summary of Consultation Undertaken

- 2.2.1 The Applicant has consulted with HDC from the earliest stages of the application process, with an initial inception meeting held in June 2023. Since this time, the Applicant has held regular joint progress meetings generally at monthly intervals with Bedford Borough Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council (collectively, the 'Host Authorities'). Following submission of the application in October 2025, the frequency of these joint progress meetings has increased to a fortnightly basis.

- 2.2.2 From the outset of the project the Host Authorities requested a joint Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with the Applicant. To achieve this, the Host Authorities agreed a separate Memorandum of Understanding between the three Host Authorities setting out areas of delegated authority in order to speak as a 'single voice' on the project. The Applicant is not privy to this Memorandum of Understanding but has supported the approach. The Applicant has agreed a single PPA with the Host Authorities that was signed in July 2025, before being extended to cover the post-submission phase through to the Secretary of State issuing a decision. The PPA includes an intent for the PPA to be extended to cover the post-decision phase, should the Scheme be granted development consent.
- 2.2.3 It is noted that each Host Authority retains their independence in reviewing the application.
- 2.2.4 The Applicant has not sought to set out every correspondence or meeting record with the Host Authorities within this dSoCG. Key areas of discussion from the pre-application, pre-examination and examination of the project have included:
- Approach to consultation;
 - Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment;
 - Approach to Scheme design;
 - Approach to environmental surveys and assessment;
 - Approach to assessment of cumulative effects; and
 - Approach to the draft Development Consent Order.

3.0 MATTERS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 The matters covered by the dSoCG on which agreement between the parties has been sought include (but are not necessarily limited to) the matters as requested in Annex F of the Examining Authority's **Rule 6 Letter [PD-005]**.
- 3.1.2 The matters that have been agreed, are under discussion, or are not agreed between the Applicant and Huntingdonshire District Council are set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Position between the Applicant and Huntingdonshire District Council on matters of discussion / consultation

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
Topic: Draft Development Consent Order				
01	The Articles of the draft DCO set out in Parts 1 to 7.	HDC and the other Host Authorities remain engaged in ongoing discussions with the Applicant regarding the draft DCO and associated Articles. Any outstanding areas of disagreement or unresolved drafting points will be captured in the final SoCG.	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that any outstanding areas of disagreement will be captured in the final SoCG. A schedule setting out those areas still under discussion or not agreed will be provided at Deadline 6.	Under Discussion
02	The description of the Authorised Development at Schedule 1 of the draft DCO.	HDC and the other Host Authorities remain engaged in ongoing discussions with the Applicant regarding the draft DCO and associated Articles. Any outstanding areas of disagreement or unresolved drafting points will be captured in the final SoCG.	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that any outstanding areas of disagreement will be captured in the final SoCG. A schedule setting out those areas still under discussion or not agreed will be provided at Deadline 6.	Under Discussion
03	The Requirements at Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, and the discharge procedure set out in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO.	HDC and the other Host Authorities remain engaged in ongoing discussions with the Applicant regarding the draft DCO and associated Articles. Any outstanding areas of disagreement or unresolved drafting points will be captured in the final SoCG.	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that any outstanding areas of disagreement will be captured in the final SoCG. A schedule setting out those areas still under discussion or not agreed will be provided at Deadline 6.	Under Discussion
04	The highways and rights of way works set out in Schedules 4 to 8 of the draft DCO.	HDC has reviewed Schedules 4 to 8 of the draft DCO and has no comment to make, deferring to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) as Local Highway Authority.	The Applicant notes this comment.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
05	The hedgerow works set out in Schedule 12 of the draft DCO.	HDC and the other Host Authorities remain engaged in ongoing discussions with the Applicant regarding the draft DCO and associated Articles. Any outstanding areas of disagreement or unresolved drafting points will be captured in the final SoCG.	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that any outstanding areas of disagreement will be captured in the final SoCG. A schedule setting out those areas still under discussion or not agreed will be provided at Deadline 6.	Under Discussion
06	The Protective Provisions set out in Schedule 13 of the draft DCO	There are no protective provisions set out in Schedule 13 of the draft DCO relevant to HDC. Comments are deferred to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) as Local Highway Authority.	The Applicant notes this comment.	Matter Agreed
07	The list of documents to be certified, set out in Schedule 15 of the draft DCO.	HDC and the other Host Authorities remain engaged in ongoing discussions with the Applicant regarding the draft DCO and associated Articles. Any outstanding areas of disagreement or unresolved drafting points will be captured in the final SoCG.	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that any outstanding areas of disagreement will be captured in the final SoCG. A schedule setting out those areas still under discussion or not agreed will be provided at Deadline 6.	Under Discussion
Topic: Other Consents and Licences				
08	The Applicant's scope of other consents and licences required for the Scheme, and the approach to obtaining these.	HDC has reviewed the list of other consents and licences set out in the Applicant's Other Consents and Licences Statement [REP3-021] and has no comment to make as Local Planning Authority, deferring to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) as Local Highway Authority and Lead Local	The Applicant notes this comment and will continue to engage with CCC on these matters.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		Flood Authority and other relevant statutory bodies.		
Topic: Control Documents				
09	The scope of the Design Parameters and Principles Document.	HDC has reviewed the Applicant's Design Parameters and Principles Document [REP1-030] and the scope is agreed.	The Applicant welcomes agreement on this matter.	Matter Agreed
10	The scope of the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	HDC broadly agrees with the oCEMP subject to the comments set out in Appendix A of HDC's Deadline 4 Submission Letter, "Comments on the Applicant's Deadline 3 Outline Management Plan Submissions", being satisfactorily addressed.	The Applicant acknowledges the matters raised in HDC's Deadline 4 submission and is considering the suggested amendments. The Applicant is engaging with HDC on the management plans, and will submit a revised version of the oCEMP at Deadline 6, following discussion with the Host Authorities.	Under Discussion
11	The scope of the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan	HDC is in-principle supportive of the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan, insofar as it relates to matters relevant to HDC's statutory functions. The oOEMP can be agreed subject to the comments set out in Appendix A of HDC's Deadline 4 Submission Letter, "Comments on the Applicant's Deadline 3 Outline Management Plan Submissions", being satisfactorily addressed. Following review of the Applicant's Technical Note on Replacement Works [REP3-075], HDC remains concerned that	The Applicant notes the comments made by the Host Authorities in relation to both the Applicant's Technical Note on Replacement Works [REP3-075] and the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP), and is preparing a further response alongside an update to the oOEMP, which will be submitted at Deadline 6, following discussion with the Host Authorities.	Under Discussion

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		replacement activities are not yet sufficiently reflected within the oOEMP as a distinct operational activity. HDC considers that the oOEMP should more clearly set out the environmental controls, monitoring, management and mitigation measures that would apply to replacement campaigns and provide an appropriate mechanism for notification, engagement and oversight by the local planning authority. HDC also continues to seek agreement on the proposed trigger(s) for replacement works and how any associated effects would be managed and controlled. Accordingly, this matter remains under discussion.		
12	The scope of the outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan	HDC considers the outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan to be acceptable in principle at this stage, insofar as it relates to matters relevant to HDC's statutory functions. The oDEMP can be agreed subject to the comments set out in Appendix A of HDC's Deadline 4 Submission Letter, "Comments on the Applicant's Deadline 3 Outline Management Plan Submissions", being satisfactorily addressed.	The Applicant acknowledges the matters raised in HDC's Deadline 4 submission and is considering the suggested amendments. The Applicant is engaging with HDC on the management plans, and will submit a revised version of the oDEMP at Deadline 6, following discussion with the Host Authorities.	Under Discussion

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
13	The scope of the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan	The oLEMP can be agreed subject to the comments set out in Appendix A of HDC's Deadline 4 Submission Letter, "Comments on the Applicant's Deadline 3 Outline Management Plan Submissions", being satisfactorily addressed.	The Applicant acknowledges the matters raised in HDC's Deadline 4 submission and is considering the suggested amendments. The Applicant is engaging with HDC on the management plans, and will submit a revised version of the oLEMP at Deadline 6, following discussion with the Host Authorities.	Under Discussion
14	The scope of the outline Soil Management Plan	The Applicant updated the oSMP [REP1-044] at Deadline 1 to commit to undertaking further detailed soil surveys of the Order limits prior to the construction phase. HDC is therefore satisfied that concerns have been addressed and the oSMP is agreed,	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
15	The scope of the outline Battery Safety Management Plan	HDC supports the outline Battery Safety Management Plan in principle, noting that the detailed content, technical adequacy and acceptability of the document are matters for Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service (and the Environment Agency where applicable) in their capacities as consultees identified in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
16	The scope of the outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan	HDC welcomes the inclusion of an Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSCEP) in so far as it is an overarching framework and is in agreement subject to final SSCEP including further analysis of	The Applicant has set out that the oSSCEP establishes an overarching framework and commitments for maximising local employment, skills development and supply chain opportunities.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		local skills gaps and provision, identification of tailored initiatives, measurable outputs, and a clear programme for stakeholder engagement. Without this, HDC considers that the potential for the Scheme to have positive economic benefits for its residents would not be fully supported by the oSSCEP as currently drafted.	Requirement 19 of the draft DCO [AS-008] secures the submission of a final Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan (SSCEP), following consultation with the relevant local planning authorities, prior to commencement of construction. The final SSCEP will include further analysis of local skills gaps and provision, identification of tailored initiatives, measurable outputs, and a clear programme for stakeholder engagement, thereby providing the route map sought by HDC.	
17	The scope of the outline Heritage Enhancement Strategy	HDC consider the oHES to be satisfactory but defers to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) given its focus on archaeological assets.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
18	The approach to mitigation for Site Preparation Works	HDC agrees with the Applicant's approach to mitigating any site preparation works insofar as it relates to matters relevant to HDC's statutory functions.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Project Benefits				
19	The benefits of the Scheme set out in Section 5 of the Planning Statement.	HDC notes the project benefits identified in Section 5 of the Planning Statement. HDC does not attribute weight to the benefits as this is ultimately a matter for the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.	The Applicant welcomes the broad agreement from HDC on the benefits identified for the Scheme, whilst acknowledging there are areas HDC consider further evidence is required to justify.	Under Discussion

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		HDC agrees with the benefits identified in Section 5.2 'Project Benefits Addressing Identified National Needs'. HDC also agrees with the benefits identified in Section 5.3 'Project Benefits Addressing Identified Local Needs', although the extent of local economic benefits associated with construction employment, operational roles and supply chain opportunities is dependent on the delivery of a satisfactory Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan secured through Requirement 19 of the dDCO [REP3-009]. HDC further agrees that the Scheme may deliver additional benefits in relation to local economic investment and biodiversity enhancement during the operational lifetime of the Scheme. However, HDC considers that these benefits should be considered in the context of the temporary nature of the development. HDC requires further evidence before reaching a position on the claimed benefits associated with the Agrisolar Research Area, enhanced access and recreation opportunities, and educational benefits arising from visitor amenity features.	In relation to HDC's position that the benefits should be considered in the context of the temporary nature of the development, the Applicant's position is that almost all of the benefit and harm arising from the Scheme should be considered in the context of the temporary nature of the development. In relation to the Agrisolar Research Area, the Applicant acknowledges that whilst discussions have been ongoing with Rothamsted as to their aspirations for the area, the specific research projects that would be pursued are not yet defined, and a detailed research strategy is not yet in place. In relation to enhanced access and recreation opportunities, the Applicant has previously set out its position that the Scheme through the delivery of additional permissive access will provide increased recreation opportunities, but acknowledges that the weight which may be afforded to this benefit could be limited. In relation to educational benefits, these are considered to arise through the delivery of the outline Heritage Enhancement Strategy which commits to further research on the historic environment, to be disseminated on site through the provision of information boards around the Site and a 'heritage trail' within Site C.	

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
Topic: Landscape and Visual				
20	The study area and methodology used for the landscape and visual impact assessment.	HDC has raised points in its Local Impact Report [REP1-078] with regards to LVIA methodology, the approach to determining significant effects and the extent to which the assessment considers long-term landscape effects. The applicant has responded to this in '8.34 Applicant Response to Deadline 2 Submissions - Host Authorities and Statutory Environmental Bodies P01' [REP3-073]. HDC notes the Applicant's explanation of the methodology and the role of professional judgement in determining significance. However, HDC remains of the view that the ES does not provide sufficient justification as to why certain operational effects assessed as moderate are not identified as significant effects.	The Applicant has provided a further response to the Host Authorities' collective comments on the LVIA at Appendix C of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) and Action Points [REP4-110] . The Applicant maintains that the methodology used for the assessment of impacts and effects is in accordance with published best practice. The Applicant will continue to discuss this matter with HDC to understand the specific viewpoints where they consider operational effects should have been assessed as significant. A final position will be set out in the final SoCG.	Under Discussion
21	The baseline data for the landscape and visual impact assessment.	HDC agree in principle with the landscape character areas and approach to identifying representative viewpoints and visual receptors for the purposes of the assessment.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
22	The measures proposed to mitigate landscape and visual effects.	HDC consider that the landscape proposals are tailored to the location and required functions of each part of the Scheme, noting that these change across the Site.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		The design is well considered and retains the legibility and character of the landscape and reduces the visual effects, where possible, especially for visual receptors, at the edges of settlements, and along routes connecting settlements.		
23	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of landscape and visual effects.	HDC broadly accepts the identification of landscape and visual effects in the LVIA. However, the Council remains concerned that the Year 10 assessment places considerable reliance on the effectiveness of mitigation planting in reducing effects over time. Whilst HDC acknowledges that mitigation planting would reduce visibility of the Scheme, it considers that greater weight should be given to the long-term presence of the development and the resulting changes to landscape character, land use, openness, views and the experience of users of Public Rights of Way over the operational lifetime of the Scheme. HDC also considers that mitigation planting may itself result in changes to landscape character which require appropriate management following decommissioning.	The Applicant welcomes HDC's position that they broadly accept the identification of landscape and visual effects in the LVIA. The Applicant considers that the Year 10 assessment is robust, and that reliance on mitigation planting is standard practice, with the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [REP3-056] setting out how the planting will be established and managed to ensure the conclusions set out in the LVIA can be relied upon. The Applicant's assessment acknowledges that planting, in some areas, will screen the infrastructure but continue to have adverse (moderate or minor adverse) effects on views. The Applicant's position is that whilst this is judged as an adverse change to a view, the change does not reach the threshold of a significant adverse environmental effect. The Applicant notes HDC's position set out at paragraph 7.17 of their Relevant Representation [RR-494] was that the Scheme: <i>"will leave a positive legacy through the delivery of strengthening and</i>	Under Discussion

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
			<i>supplementing the landscape character within the Order Limits post operation".</i> The Applicant will continue to discuss this matter with HDC. A final position will be set out in the final SoCG.	
Topic: Glint and Glare				
24	The conclusions in respect of the glint and glare assessment	HDC is satisfied that the glint and glare impacts of the Scheme would be acceptable.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Cultural Heritage				
25	The study area and methodology used for the assessment of impacts on the historic environment.	HDC agrees with the study area and methodology used for the heritage assessment. The Technical Note on Warren House [REP4-116] submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 4 is welcomed and satisfies the requirement to assess the impact of the proposed development on the Grade II* listed Warren House. HDC agrees that the photomontage contained in Appendix A of the Technical Note [REP4-116] provides a robust and reasonable representation of the likely visual relationship between the heritage asset and the Scheme. The Council is satisfied with the approach taken by the Applicant and	The Applicant welcomes agreement on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		agrees the methodology used to assess the effects on Warren House.		
26	The baseline data for the historic environment.	HDC is satisfied with the baseline presented for the assessment to the historic environment.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
27	The measures proposed to mitigate impacts on the historic environment.	HDC is satisfied with the mitigation proposed for the historic environment, but defers to CCC with respect to comments on mitigation for archaeology.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
28	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of effects on the historic environment.	HDC is in broad agreement with the conclusions of the assessment of effects on the historic environment. In relation to Warren House, HDC agrees that the photomontage submitted within the Technical Note on Warren House [REP4-116] provides a robust and reasonable representation of the likely visual relationship between the heritage asset and the Scheme. The Council considers that the proposed development would result in an impact on long-distance views from Warren House through the introduction of solar panels into the landscape. Whilst HDC does not agree with the Applicant's characterisation of the Scheme as being "barely perceptible", it agrees that the intervening landform associated with the Kimbolton Castle Estate mitigates the	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		impact. Based on the Technical Note and photomontage provided [REP4-116], HDC is satisfied that the impact on the setting of Warren House would result in less than substantial harm, consistent with the Applicant's assessment.		
Topic: Ecology and Biodiversity				
29	The study areas and methodology used for the assessment of ecological receptors and resources.	HDC agree with the study areas and methodology used for the assessment of ecological receptors and resources.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
30	The baseline data for the assessment of ecological receptors and resources.	HDC considers the survey data relied on for the assessment to be adequate.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
31	The measures proposed to mitigate impacts to ecological receptors and resources.	HDC welcomes the proposed ecological mitigation and compensation, with the measures reflected in the oCEMP [REP3-048] and oLEMP [REP3-056] and carried through into the detailed management plans as secured by Requirements 4 and 5 of the draft DCO [REP3-009] any potential significant effects can be appropriately mitigated.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
32	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of impacts and effects to ecological receptors and resources.	HDC agree with the Applicant's assessment in respect of statutory designated sites for nature conservation.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
33	The biodiversity net gain assessment.	HDC is broadly satisfied with the Applicant's approach to BNG, acknowledging that it is not mandatory for this Scheme.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Habitats Regulations Assessment				
34	The Applicant's conclusion that the Scheme will not have adverse effects on the integrity of a European Site.	This matter is agreed. As set out in the Statement of Common Ground (REP1-062) with Natural England, which confirms agreement with the conclusions of the Applicant's Information to Inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment [APP-035].	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Flood Risk and Drainage				
35	The Applicant's Flood Risk Assessment.	HDC is satisfied with the Applicant's Flood Risk Assessment insofar as it relates to matters relevant to HDC's statutory functions. HDC defers to CCC as Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
36	The Scheme meets the requirements of the 'Sequential Test'.	HDC is satisfied that the Scheme meets the requirements of the Sequential Test.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
37	The Scheme meets the requirements of the 'Exception Test'.	HDC is satisfied that the Scheme meets the requirements of the Exception Test.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Noise and Vibration				
38	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of noise and vibration.	HDC agree with the conclusions of the Applicant's assessment of noise and vibration.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Air Quality				
39	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of air quality.	HDC agree with the conclusions of the Applicant's assessment of air quality.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Ground Conditions				
40	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of ground conditions.	HDC agree with the conclusions of the Applicant's assessment of ground conditions.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
Topic: Land Use and Soils				
41	The methodology used for the assessment of impacts and effects on land and soils.	HDC agree with the methodology used for the assessment of impacts and effects on land and soils.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
42	The survey data for the assessment of land and soils.	HDC raised concerns in its relevant representation regarding the adequacy of the survey data for land and soils, and whilst it enables an assessment of the worst-case project effects, it hinders development of a detailed soil management plan. HDC considered the Applicant's oral submission on this matter at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) and accept the approach undertaken by the Applicant.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
43	The measures proposed to mitigate impacts on soils.	HDC is satisfied with the Applicant's proposed mitigation measures set out in the outline Soil Management Plan, on the basis that the Applicant has updated the oSMP [REP1-044] to commit to undertaking further detailed soil surveys of the Order limits prior to the construction phase, in order to inform the final Soil Management Plan.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
44	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of land and soils.	HDC consider the overall conclusions broadly meet professional judgement regarding the significance of residual effects. Minor points of disagreement remain in terms of the claimed benefits on soil resources and the impact of the Scheme resulting from proposed areas of woodland and hedgerow.	The Applicant welcomes the broad agreement with the assessment made. With regard the claimed benefits on soil resources, the Applicant highlights the response at HDC-D2-21 in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions – Host Authorities and Statutory Environmental Bodies [REP3-073] where the Council accepted the Applicant's position agreeing that only limited positive weight should be afforded to the condition of soils following the operational phase. With regard the impact of the Scheme resulting from proposed areas of woodland and hedgerow, the Applicant provided its position in response to Q2.7.1 in the Applicant Response to ExA Second Written Questions [REP4-113]. The Applicant will continue to discuss these matters with HDC. A final position will be set out in the final SoCG.	Under Discussion
Topic: Socio Economics				
45	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of socio-economics.	HDC is satisfied with the assessment of socio-economic effects.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
Topic: Climate Change				
46	The methodology used for the assessment of climate change impacts and effects.	HDC welcome the approach taken by the Applicant in carrying out the greenhouse gas assessment, and the methodology applied to the Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA) and note that it is consistent with guidance issued by ISEP.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
47	The baseline data for the assessment of climate change impacts.	HDC note that an inconsistent use of historic climate data is apparent. The current baseline uses data for Bedford for the period 1991-2020 while the future baseline uses data for the same location from 1981-2010. This inconsistency is unlikely to compromise the overall outcome of the CCRA, but should be addressed.	The Applicant acknowledges the noted inconsistency in the presentation of the historic climate data within the Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA). Upon review, the Applicant confirms that this inconsistency is an error in reporting. The 1991-2020 dataset has been consistently used to calculate both the current and future climate baselines, in line with the methodology and guidance issued by ISEP.	Matter Agreed
48	The measures proposed to mitigate climate change impacts.	HDC broadly agree with the measures proposed to mitigate impacts on climate change.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
49	The conclusions in respect of the assessment of climate change impacts and effects.	HDC broadly agree with the conclusions of the climate change assessment.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
Topic: Human Health				
50	The conclusions in respect of the Scheme's effects on human health.	HDC is satisfied that subject to the required mitigation being secured through the draft DCO, the Scheme does not pose a significant risk to human health insofar as it relates to matters relevant to HDC's statutory functions.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Major Accidents and Disasters				
51	The conclusions in respect of major accidents and disasters.	HDC do not dispute the conclusions in respect of major accidents and disasters, insofar as it relates to matters relevant to HDC's statutory functions.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Electromagnetic Fields				
52	The conclusions in respect of the Scheme's impacts arising from electromagnetic fields.	HDC notes and does not dispute the conclusions in respect of the Scheme's impacts arising from electromagnetic fields.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed

Ref.	Summary of Matter	HDC Position	Applicant Position	Status
Topic: Cumulative Effects				
53	The scope of other developments assessed for potential cumulative effects.	HDC agree with the scope of other developments assessed by the Applicant in its assessment of cumulative effects.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
54	The conclusions of the assessment of cumulative effects.	HDC agree with the conclusions of the Applicant's assessment of cumulative effects.	The Applicant welcomes agreement with HDC on this matter.	Matter Agreed
Topic: Compulsory Acquisition				
55	The land rights sought by the Applicant through the draft DCO insofar as they relate to HDC.	HDC has no objection to the land rights identified in the draft DCO, as these do not relate to any HDC land interests or assets.	The Applicant notes this comment.	Matter Agreed

APPENDIX A

BSSL Cambsbed 1 Ltd

Name:

Signature:

Position:

On behalf of:

BSSL Cambsbed 1 Ltd

Date:

Huntingdonshire District Council

Name:

Signature:

Position:

On behalf of:

Huntingdonshire District Council

Date:
