

**Tillbridge Solar Project
EN010142**

**Applicant's Comments on Interested Parties'
Submissions to First Written Questions at
Deadline 3**

Document Reference: EN010142/APP/9.33

**Planning Act 2008
The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

**January 2025
Revision Number: 00**

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose of this document	3
2. Applicant's comments on Interested Parties' Submissions to First Written Questions at Deadline 3	4
The Secretary of State's Conclusion on Landscape and Visual matters is set out below:	8
Appendix A WLDC Response to ExQ Q1.1.5	56
3. References	75

Tables

Table 2-1. Applicant's response to Interested Parties' submissions 4

Table 2-2 Applicant's response to WLDC Response to ExQ 1.1.5 56

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide additional comments on submissions by Interested Parties' to the ExA's first written questions submitted at Deadline 3 that include matters that have not been considered previously.
- 1.1.2 The Applicant's responses to the ExA's first written questions were provided at Deadline 3 **[REP3-062]**. Where the submissions by Interested Parties to the ExA's first written questions do not raise new matters to which the Applicant wishes to respond, or which raise matters which the Applicant considers it has already appropriately responded to in its original response to the ExA's first written questions as provided at Deadline 3 **[REP3-062]**, then those submissions have not been included in **Table 2-1** below. **Table 2-1** only includes matters the Applicant has new or further comments on which arise from the submissions of Interested Parties.
- 1.1.3 The Interested Parties' submissions to the ExA's first written questions at Deadline 3 which include matters that the Applicant would like to comment on are set out in **Table 2-1** below

2. Applicant's comments on Interested Parties' Submissions to First Written Questions at Deadline 3

Table 2-1. Applicant's response to Interested Parties' submissions

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
Q1.1.9	LCC	<p>Planning balance</p> <p>The Examining Authority (ExA) notes LCCs conclusions contained in its WR [REP2-012]. However, could LCC please outline how it considers these conclusions and the alleged 'impacts' should be balanced in light of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 Paragraph 4.1.7?</p>	<p>This states <i>"Where this NPS or the relevant technology specific NPSs require an applicant to mitigate a particular impact as far as possible, but the Secretary of State considers that there would still be residual adverse effects after the implementation of such mitigation measures, the Secretary of State should weigh those residual effects against the benefits of the proposed development. For projects which qualify as CNP Infrastructure, it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects in all but the most exceptional cases. This presumption, however, does not apply to residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or interference with, human health and public safety, defence, irreplaceable habitats or unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero. Further, the same exception applies to this presumption for residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference offshore to navigation, or onshore to flood and coastal erosion risk."</i></p> <p>The thrust of this paragraph is that only in exceptional cases will the impact of these residual effects outweigh the need for CNP infrastructure. It is not clear what the test is to be identified as 'exceptional' in which case it appears to be the judgement of the Secretary of State as to what exceptional is.</p> <p>The County Council has been shown that the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development when considered cumulatively with the other schemes that have been consented, Cottam and West Burton that the negative impacts on the landscape are at a regional scale of significance. It is the Council's assertion that to create an impact at a regional scale meets the case of 'exceptional' and for that reason the need for the development is not outweighed by the exceptional harm that the Council has demonstrated with its landscape evidence. Consequently in the planning balance the harm (residual effects) of the development is exceptional and therefore outweighs the need for the scheme.</p>	<p>The Applicant strongly disagrees with LCC's submissions as to how the NPS should be applied and that the extent and nature of impacts from the Scheme trigger exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Balancing residual landscape and visual effects</p> <p>In terms of the approach to decision making and consideration of whether residual adverse landscape and visual effects are outweighed by the benefits of the Scheme, that exercise should be considered in the context of section 5.10 of NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1). Section 5.10 records at 5.10.5 that <i>"Virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape"</i> and at 5.10.13 that <i>"All proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites"</i>. 5.10.4 records that <i>"The Secretary of State will have to judge whether the visual effects on sensitive receptors, such as local residents, and other receptors, such as visitors to the local area, outweigh the benefits of the project"</i>, in the context of 5.10.12 which records that <i>"locally valued landscapes should not be used in themselves to refuse consent, as this may unduly restrict acceptable development"</i>.</p> <p>In terms of Secretary of State decision making, EN-1 states at 5.10.35 – 5.10.38:</p> <p><i>"5.10.35 The scale of energy projects means that they will often be visible across a very wide area. The Secretary of State should judge whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it is not offset by the benefits (including need) of the project.</i></p> <p><i>5.10.36 In reaching a judgement, the Secretary of State should consider whether any adverse impact is temporary, such as during construction, and/or whether any adverse impact on the landscape will be capable of being reversed in a timescale that the Secretary of State considers reasonable.</i></p> <p><i>5.10.37 The Secretary of State should consider whether the project has been designed carefully, taking account of environmental effects on the landscape and siting, operational and other relevant constraints, to minimise harm to the landscape, including by appropriate mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>5.10.38 The Secretary of State should consider whether requirements to the consent are needed requiring the incorporation of particular design details that</i></p>
Q.1.1.10	WLDC	<p>Planning balance</p> <p>The Examining Authority (ExA) notes WLDCs conclusions with</p>	<p>Section 104 of the PA2008 requires that an application must comply with a relevant NPS and that they must be decided in</p>	

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		<p>regard to the planning balance at Section 8 of its Written Representation [REP2-016]. However, could WLDC please outline how it considers these conclusions and the alleged 'impacts' should be balanced in light of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 Paragraph 4.1.7?</p>	<p>accordance with them unless, inter alia, the adverse impact of the proposed development outweighs its benefit.</p> <p>The impacts of the Tillbridge Solar Project must therefore firstly satisfy the NPS and, if so, a balance of its adverse impacts with its benefits must then be carried out.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.1.7 relates to a section providing policy on '<i>weighing impacts and benefits</i>'. It states that '<i>where an NPS requires an applicant to mitigate a particular impact as far as possible, but the Secretary of State considers that there would still be residual adverse effects after the implementation of such measure, the Secretary of State should weigh those residual effects against the benefits of the proposed development.</i>'</p> <p>It further states that, for projects that qualify as CNP infrastructure, it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects in all but the 'most exceptional' cases.</p> <p>With regard to the cumulative impact of the Tillbridge Solar Project with the other three solar NSIP projects either consented or awaiting decision, WLDC considers these impacts to be 'exceptional'. The magnitude of landscape character change for a period of 60 years is significant and adverse in planning policy terms.</p> <p>The consideration of four large scale solar NSIP applications within the same rural district, covering an area of approximately 2795ha / 27.9km2 with panels and BESS is unprecedented. There is no other example of a decision made under the PA2008 that is comparable. WLDC is not aware of any other NSIP that has been tested against NPSs EN-1 and EN-3 with regard to the magnitude of cumulative impacts as will be required in the determination of the Tillbridge Solar Project.</p> <p>WLDC therefore considers paragraph 4.1.7 (and the section of NPS EN-1 to which it relates) to reflect precisely the manner in which application must be determined. It confirms that how the balancing of impacts and benefits should be carried to establish compliance and noncompliance with section 104 of the PA2008. Paragraph 4.1.7 is helpful in reminding decision makers that, notwithstanding the positive policy balance towards the need for energy impacts and their inherent impacts in themselves, there is a need to give</p>	<p><i>are in keeping with the statutory and technical requirements for landscape and visual impacts."</i></p> <p>For the Scheme, the residual landscape and visual effects are as follows at year 15 once landscape mitigation has been established, significant adverse landscape effects are reduced to the LLCA 3A: Till Vale – Open Farmland only and upon three viewpoints (VP7: B1398 Middle Street, Glentworth Cliff, VP9: Kexby Road, west of Glentworth Grange: junction with bridleway Gltw/85/1 and VP13 Public Footpath (Hems/787/82), Millfield, Hemswell. Cumulative effects at year 15, relate to landscape effects upon the LLCA 3a Till Vale Open Farmland and visual effects upon VP7 B1398 Middle Street, Glentworth Cliff Farm and VP13 Public Footpath (Hems/787/2) on Lincoln Cliff, Hemswell (Millfield).</p> <p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy from site selection (avoiding nationally designated landscapes) through to design of the Scheme and additional measures included in management plans, such as the Framework LEMP.</p> <p>The design development of the Scheme has followed the mitigation hierarchy, and all residual effects have been reduced as far as practicable. The only remaining residual effects include significant adverse effects upon landscape character due to the change in use of the land, with localised landscape and visual impacts being relatively limited and local in nature..</p> <p>Views from representative viewpoints looking towards the Scheme will comprise glimpsed views of the Scheme in the foreground and the cumulative developments in the background in a distance. Due to the distance, this will be largely imperceptible. The Scheme includes robust landscape mitigation measures to be secured in accordance with the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] and Works Plans [REP2-004]. The design iteration of the Scheme sought to include suitable buffers between Tillbridge and Cottam to the south and north, with this being the closest scheme to the Principal Site to minimise interactions and effects and to reduce cumulative impacts. As landscaping matures, visual effects in relation to the Scheme and in combination with the other developments will be localised and the change in landscape effects will relate to local character only. The scale of impact both on its own and in combination with the other developments will not be at a regional scale, but a local level. This conclusion has already been endorsed by both the ExAs and Secretary of State in relation to the granting of development consent for the Gate Burton Energy Park and the Cottam Solar Project as set out below.</p> <p>The consideration required of the Secretary of State will involve taking into account the remaining significant effects on landscape and viewpoints, which amount, in year 15, to significant effects on 3 viewpoints and on one locally designated character area, as set out above. This is to be balanced against the contribution to the demonstrated urgent need for the Scheme, which must be</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>appropriate weight to residual impacts in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>As stated above, the situation affecting the West Lindsey District is unprecedented and unique. This gives rise to level of cumulative impacts that are ‘exceptional’, imposing such a magnitude of change to a rural agricultural landscape character and visual effects baseline, that such disbenefits outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>In terms of considering the acceptability of the project against planning policy, the impacts identified are taken directly from the applicant’s ES and other supporting documents. WLDC’s objection to the application is based upon the application of all of the supporting documents (of which the ES is one) against the policy framework.</p>	<p>given substantial weight (see NPS EN-1 3.2.6 – 3.2.8 (Ref 1-1)). The Applicant’s position is that the Scheme’s benefits, in particular its contribution to the urgent need for low carbon generation, outweigh and justify the localised landscape and visual significant residual effects. This is in the context of section 5.10 of EN-1 which requires application of the mitigation hierarchy and, despite its application, anticipates that large scale energy infrastructure is very likely to have some significant adverse effects of this nature.</p> <p>The Applicant’s view is that the adverse landscape and visual effects are outweighed at this stage, including when considered cumulatively, and there is not necessarily a need to apply the CNP presumption as a result. That position is aligned with the approach taken by the Secretary of State in the decisions to grant development consent for both the Gate Burton and Cottam Solar NSIPs. As the Applicant has explained in response to First Written Question 1.1.28 [REP3-062] the 2023 NPSs were important and relevant considerations in the determination of those applications, pursuant to section 105 of the Planning Act 2008, rather than section 104 (under which the Scheme is to be determined) where the Secretary of State must decide the application in accordance with the relevant NPSs (unless specific exceptions apply). Relevant extracts are provided below from these decisions, both in relation to conclusions on cumulative landscape and visual effects and how those were then taken into account in the balancing exercise and any consideration of the need for the CNP presumption. It can be seen that the approach taken aligns with the approach advocated by the Applicant with respect to the Scheme.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.8.78 and 3.8.79 of the ExA’s recommendation report on the Gate Burton Energy Park concludes by stating that:</p> <p><i>“I have sympathy with the proposition that, with the other solar schemes in place in the locality, there would be opportunity during movement through the area for views of solar arrays to become frequent either in glimpsed views through gaps in hedges, accesses or changes in topography, and that this could lead to a greater influence on the appreciation of the landscape and the features that contributed to it. I am therefore of the view that the cumulative effect of the schemes together would add to any harmful effects and would lead to greater adverse effects.</i></p> <p><i>I am, however, mindful that this is in a relatively limited area (comparatively speaking in respect of the National, Regional and District LCA), that there are other significant features on the horizon and wider views (the Cottam and West Burton Power Stations) which also contribute to the overall character...”</i></p> <p>Paragraph 3.8.81 of the ExA’s recommendation report on the Gate Burton Energy Park goes on to state that moving through the landscape would mostly affect car passengers due to the travel times between the sites, with the timing shorter and therefore the incidents perceived as more frequent.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8.83 of the ExA’s recommendation report on the Gate Burton Energy Park refers to the long view from Tillbridge Lane and the B1398 are</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p>representative of longer views from the Jurassic ridge (Lincoln Cliff). It states that:</p> <p><i>“Given the distance to the site, in the region of 9km, and the intervening landform, screening and height of the solar array panels, this would not be a significant discernible feature in the landscape.”</i></p> <p>In conclusion, the ExA at paragraph 3.8.94 states:</p> <p><i>“I conclude that the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development in association with the other solar schemes in the area (Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge) would lead to additional harm and would through sequential experiences contribute to a greater awareness of solar development in the locality, which would be harmful at a local scale.”</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State agreed with the ExA (paragraph 4.1.144 of the decision) that the Gate Burton Energy Park would be a small proportion of the wider LCA area and therefore that there would be no significant landscape effects on LCAs at a regional, county or district scale.</p> <p>The SoS’s decision letter on Gate Burton recorded:</p> <p><i>“4.140. Regarding cumulative effects, the ExA considered that the cumulative effect of the schemes together would add to any harmful effects and lead to greater adverse effects [ER 3.8.78]. The ExA characterised this as a moderate adverse effect cumulatively given that the area affected is relatively limited, the mitigation measures for all schemes would seek to reduce visual effects, the discrete positioning of each scheme limits opportunities for them to be viewed together and it would only be while sequentially passing through the area that such views are identified [ER 3.8.80].</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>4.142. The ExA concluded the Proposed Development would result in material harm to the landscape character of the area, additional harm would result from cumulative effects with the other solar schemes in the area and this harm would remain an adverse residual effect on the landscape character of the area [ER 3.8.93 et seq.]. The ExA concluded the Proposed Development would result in material harm to the visual amenity of the area during the lifetime of the Proposed Development but that longer distant views from the Jurassic ridge would be limited and not significant due to distance, landform and landscaping [ER 3.8.96].The ExA concluded the Proposed Development would result in material harm to the visual amenity of the area during the lifetime of the Proposed Development but that longer distant views from the Jurassic ridge would be limited and not significant due to distance, landform and landscaping [ER 3.8.96].</i></p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p><i>The ExA concluded that moderate negative weight should be attributed in the overall balance to the harms as a result of the Proposed Development, and cumulatively, to landscape and visual amenity [ER 3.8.98].</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State’s Conclusion on Landscape and Visual matters is set out below:</p> <p><i>4.143. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Applicant’s ES and considers that sufficient information has been provided regarding landscape and visual effects from the Proposed Development and cumulatively with the other solar schemes in the area. The Secretary of State has had careful regard to the photomontages in assisting his conclusions. The Secretary of State is satisfied with the methodology and conclusions of the Applicant’s ES.</i></p> <p><i>4.144. The Secretary of State recognises the value placed by the local community on the AGLV and acknowledges the Proposed Development will harm the AGLV. The Secretary of State notes 2011 NPS EN-1 which advises that locally valued landscapes should not be used in themselves to refuse consent. The Secretary of State ascribes limited negative weight to the impact to the AGLV during the lifetime of the Proposed Development, noting that the Applicant does not foresee significant effects on the AGLV at any point during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Secretary of State further notes the impact on three LLCAs during the lifetime of the Proposed Development but agrees with the ExA that the Solar and Energy Storage Park site is a small proportion of the wider LCA areas and that there would be no significant landscape effects on LCAs at regional, county or district scale.</i></p> <p><i>4.145. The Secretary of State considers there would be some significant adverse visual effects on some receptors during construction, early operation and decommissioning, which reduce in magnitude and significance as mitigation planting matures. The Secretary of State is satisfied that the views from the Jurassic ridge had been properly assessed and that the longer views from the Tillbridge Lane viewpoint were representative of typical views from the Jurassic ridge, which would not be significant adverse at any point during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Secretary of State ascribes limited negative weight to the visual effects of the Proposed Development, noting that there are no significant adverse cumulative effects on visual receptors.</i></p> <p><i>4.146. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA that the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development in conjunction with West Burton, Cottam and Tillbridge solar projects leads to a moderate adverse landscape effect and that material harm to the landscape character would result.</i></p> <p><i>4.147. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA that moderate negative weight should be attributed in the overall balance to the harms as a result of the Proposed Development, and cumulatively, to landscape and visual amenity.”</i></p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p>The Secretary of State then concluded as follows:</p> <p><i>“7.9. As detailed above, the Secretary of State accords moderate negative weight to historic environment, limited negative weight to human health and wellbeing, moderate negative weight to landscape and visual and moderate negative weight to the impact on BMV land.</i></p> <p><i>7.10. The Secretary of State has considered and weighed the benefits and harms that have been identified. Although the Secretary of State has reached a different conclusion from the ExA in respect of some of the harms resulting from the Proposed Development, the Secretary of State also concludes that the Proposed Development is in accordance with relevant policy, and that the harms identified in this case, including cumulatively with other solar projects in the locality, are clearly outweighed by the substantial weight that attaches to the provision of urgently needed low-carbon and renewable infrastructure, along with the other identified benefits.”</i></p> <p>Paragraphs 3.6.65 to 3.6.71 of the ExA recommendation report for the Cottam Solar Project considers cumulative landscape effects. The ExA did not agree with either WLDC or LCC that the proposed development in combination with the other projects, including Tillbridge would lead to an adverse effect on landscape and visual to the extent that it would harm both local and regional landscape character. The Secretary of State also agreed with this conclusion. This is set out below:</p> <p>In the decision on Cottam, the Examining Authority recorded:</p> <p><i>“Cumulative landscape effects</i> <i>3.6.65. WLDC and LCC’s concerns in respect of regional landscape character relate to the cumulative impact of the Proposed Development with other development (in particular the West Burton, Gate Burton and Tillbridge solar projects). In summary, they consider the mass and scale of these projects combined would lead to adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity over an extensive area, replacing large areas of rural agricultural land with solar panels and negatively affecting the current sparsely settled and quiet agricultural character of the area. Furthermore, they consider the landscape character of the local, and potentially regional area, may be completely altered, particularly when experienced sequentially while travelling through the landscape.</i></p> <p><i>3.6.66. They consider the residual cumulative effects on the Regional Scale LCT – 4a Unwooded vales character area would be moderate adverse while cumulative effects on land use would be moderate to major adverse. These concerns were echoed by a number of other IPs including 7000 Acres.</i></p> <p><i>3.6.67. We do not agree. ES Appendix 8.2 (Assessment of Potential Landscape Effects) [REP-020] provides an extensive assessment of the cumulative effect</i></p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p><i>of the Proposed Development with other development on both the Regional Scale LCT – 4a Unwooded Vales and on land use as a fine grained receptor.</i></p> <p><i>3.6.68. In terms of the former, it identifies no significant cumulative effects would arise as a result of the Proposed Development along with other cumulative development. It points to the screening provided by the embedded and additional mitigation and the ability of the landscape to accommodate some change without undue adverse effects.</i></p> <p><i>3.6.69. Likewise, when considering the cumulative effects at a fine-grained level, it recognises the Proposed Development along with the other solar schemes would introduce new elements and features to the landscape in the form of solar panels, resulting in a moderate adverse effect during construction at year 1 of operation. However, it considers that due to the low level nature of the different elements, coupled with the embedded and additional mitigation, the cumulative effects would reduce to minor adverse by year 15.</i></p> <p><i>3.6.70. It was evident from our site inspections that while there would be some intervisibility between the Proposed Development and other cumulative development, this would be limited. While there would be some changes to land use over a large area, where evident, it would be seen in the context of an extensive agricultural landscape and in many locations the panels would be distributed in and amongst the existing landscape features helping the low level structures assimilate into the landscape.</i></p> <p><i>3.6.71. Consequently, while we accept there would be some significant cumulative effects on land use during construction and at year 1 of operation, we do not agree that it would create what would be perceived as an ‘energy’ landscape. Furthermore, we are satisfied that the Applicant has demonstrated that, subject to the successful implementation and maintenance of the proposed mitigation measures, there are unlikely to be significant residual adverse cumulative effects at year 15 of operation.”</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State concluded:</p> <p><i>“The Secretary of State’s Conclusion</i> <i>4.23. On balance, whilst the landscape effects of the Proposed Development are in some areas significantly adverse – such as the cumulative effects on fine-grained land use, topography and watercourses receptors, and communications and infrastructure receptors – these significantly adverse effects are in most cases expected to be non-significant by either year 1 or year 15. Although 15 years is not a negligible period of time, it is considered relatively short when compared to the 60-year lifecycle of the Proposed Development. The visual effects, however, are significant at a number of viewpoints during construction and year 1. These effects are expected to last beyond year 15 except in the case of the seven residential properties, though no wider cumulative effects are expected. Whilst landscape and visual impacts are unavoidable, the impact on existing landscape character and visual amenities is moderate. As such, the</i></p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p><i>Secretary of State agrees with the ExA's assessment and conclusions and therefore ascribes this matter moderate negative weight in the planning balance."</i></p> <p>In both decisions, the SoS considered the adverse residual effects of the schemes were outweighed by their benefits, and did not expressly consider the CNP presumption, albeit the Examining Authority did consider this in each decision:</p> <p><u>Gate Burton – ExA's recommendation report –</u></p> <p><i>"5.3.20. On the basis of the above the CNP presumption would apply. This states that where residual non-HRA or non-MCZ impacts remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure. Therefore, in all but the most exceptional circumstances, it is unlikely that consent will be refused on the basis of these residual impacts. None of the identified exceptions which are set out at paragraph 4.2.15 of 2024 NPS EN-1 of my judgement are engaged.</i></p> <p><i>5.3.21. As a result, the NPS advises the Secretary of State will take as the starting point for decision-making that such infrastructure is to be treated as if it has met any tests which are set out within the NPSs, or any other planning policy, which requires a clear outweighing of harm, exceptionality or very special circumstances. None of the non-exhaustive list apply to this case albeit I have concluded that the public benefits of the case outweigh the less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets which could be construed to fall within this advice.</i></p> <p><i>5.3.22. There are no exceptional circumstances that I have identified and therefore the CNP policy would suggest that any adverse residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>5.3.23. I have concluded above that I consider that the final balance weighs strongly in favour of granting Development Consent. Therefore, whilst the CNP policy does not change that conclusion, and it is not of direct effect in this application, it is an important and relevant matter and adds further support and weight to my conclusion on the acceptability of the Proposed Development."</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State's decision letter for Gate Burton Solar Park concludes that <i>"The Secretary of State considers that the national need as set out in the relevant NPSs outweighs the Proposed Development's potential adverse impacts, as mitigated by the proposed terms of the Order"</i> (7.11). The residual effects for Gate Burton Solar Park are comparable to the Scheme's (less than substantial harm to heritage assets and harm to landscape areas and visual receptors), and it is considered that the same conclusion should be applied to the Scheme in the balancing exercise.</p> <p><u>Cottam – ExA's recommendation report –</u></p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p><i>“8.2.8. We are satisfied that the mitigation hierarchy has been fully explored and the mitigation proposed has been secured by the requirements and other controls included in the rDCO. However, as our recommendation is already in favour of the Proposed Development, we do not consider it is necessary to apply the further tests set out in 2024 NPS EN-1 in relation to Critical National Priority.”</i></p> <p>The ExA's recommendation report for the Cottam Solar Project sets out concerns raised during examination with respect to the approach to cumulative effects between each NSIP application (Gate Burton, Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge). The ExA agreed with the Applicant's approach to the assessment of cumulative effects in considering a reasonable worst-case scenario (all schemes being implemented). The decision made by the Secretary of State also agreed with the ExA's conclusions with respect to cumulative effects. Paragraph 3.13.24 of the recommendation report states that:</p> <p><i>“In the present case, the Applicant’s assessment has considered the worst-case scenario where all projects considered are consented. In doing so it has identified the likely significant effects set out in paragraph 3.13.15 above. It follows that in the event any combinations of those projects were permitted, it would be no worse than those identified in the Applicant’s ES.”</i></p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.10 of the ExA recommendation report into the Cottam Solar Project concludes on the overall planning balance confirming that:</p> <p><i>“Taking the above factors into account and having had regard to all important and relevant matters, we conclude that there are no adverse impacts of sufficient weight, either on their own or collectively, that would mean that the DCO should not be made.”</i></p> <p>The Gate Burton Energy Park and the Cottam Solar Project (and now West Burton) have gained development consent, and in each case the cumulative effects with Tillbridge have been before the decision makers and expressly considered. In both decisions, the Examining Authorities and the Secretary of State agreed that the benefits of the schemes, including the significant contribution they would make to the urgent need for renewable energy, would out weigh adverse residual landscape and visual effects (including cumulatively).</p> <p>Application of the Critical National Priority (CNP) presumption Without prejudice to the Applicant's position as set out above, we have gone on to address the CNP presumption.</p> <p>The CNP presumption and its application are found in NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 4.2.7 confirms the CNP policy will be applied following normal consideration of the need case and impacts of the scheme and the application of the

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p>mitigation hierarchy. The CNP policy will be relevant to any residual effects identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 4.2.15 states that where residual impacts (non-HRA and non-MCZ) remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, these residual impacts are “unlikely to outweigh the urgent need” for the type of infrastructure that includes the Scheme. That is the presumption. It goes on to say that "in all but the most exceptional circumstances" it is unlikely that consent will be refused on the basis of these residual impacts.• 4.2.15 then lists some exceptions to the presumption of consent relating to unacceptable risks to things such as public safety, defence, flooding. None of these apply in the case of the Scheme.• 4.2.16 then says, as a result the SoS will take as a starting point for decision making that such infrastructure is to be treated as if it has met any tests which are set out within the NPSs or any other planning policy, which requires a clear outweighing of harm, exceptionality or very special circumstances.• 4.2.17 goes on to list some of those situations where the starting point should be that the CNP infrastructure has met required tests. By starting point it means that the decision maker starts from the position that the tests are met unless there is clear evidence to support coming to a contrary view. The list includes: development in the Green Belt needing very special circumstances, development within a Site of Special Scientific Interest, development in a nationally designated landscape (for example, landscapes previously referred to as AONB) requiring exceptional circumstances, substantial harm or loss of significance to heritage assets that should be exceptional or wholly exceptional. <p>Paragraph 4.2.17 is referencing landscapes and areas with the highest levels of protection. They have been given those levels of protection reflecting their importance and the statutory duties in relation to them. It is useful to reference section 5.10 of EN-1 in this respect which, in the context of landscape and visual effects, refers at 5.10.7 to National Parks, the Broads and AONBs as having “<i>the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and natural beauty</i>”. Paragraphs 5.10.8 – 5.10.11 and 5.10.32 – 5.10.34 then expand upon the statutory duties and level of protection afforded to those landscapes. Paragraph 4.2.17 provides that even for these landscapes, which have national importance and the highest status of protection, and where exceptional circumstances are required to be demonstrated, the “<i>Secretary of State will take as a starting point that CNP Infrastructure will meet</i>” that test of amounting to exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The types of impact on locally designated landscapes and views from the Scheme including cumulatively, are clearly not of a scale or in any way comparable with the residual effects contemplated within paragraph 4.2.17 of EN-1. The CNP presumption applies “<i>in all but the most exceptional circumstances</i>”, and the Applicant’s position is that the residual harm associated with the Scheme is far from the types of effects that may be in the realm of exceptional circumstances, let alone “the most” exceptional circumstances.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				Finally, the Scheme has an August 2028 grid connection date. Unlike many solar DCOs in the process of seeking development consent, this is a scheme that has a real prospect of generating renewable energy by 2030, contributing to the Government's goals in this respect. If anything, by not applying the presumption in line with EN-1, this poses an unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero.
Q1.3.10	LCC	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>Could LCC please clarify how the assertions relating to Climate Change and GHG emissions in its WR [REP2-012] accord with the conclusion at Paragraph 7.17 of its LIR [REP1A-001] that “The Council’s position is therefore that, adopting a ‘whole life’ approach to GHG emissions, there are no negative and neutral impacts and that significant positive impacts would accrue”?</p>	<p>Due to the limited time between the need for the LIR to be submitted at DL1 and the Committee meeting when the Council confirmed its written comments on the application there was no opportunity to update the LIR before it needed to be submitted at DL1. Consequently the Council’s views on climate change and GHG emissions are those set out in its written response WR [REP2-012] rather than what is stated in paragraph 7.17 of the LIR.</p>	<p>In response to LCC’s comments on lost food production, the Applicant refers to Table 7-8 of Chapter 7: Climate Change of the ES [APP-038], where the Applicant’s position is set out on land selection and the overall benefit of the Scheme in terms of its substantial contribution to the achievement of net zero. Similar projects have demonstrated a significant improvement in lifetime Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions for solar installations when compared to traditional fossil fuel energy sources. Additionally, diversifying the electricity grid will only benefit energy security. While site selection was initially driven from an established point of connection to the national grid (following the identification of the east of England as a suitable region within which to search for a site given irradiation levels and topography), the Applicant has considered many factors in determining the site ultimately selected for the Scheme including environmental and planning considerations and designations. Consideration has also been given to minimise the use of any Best and Most Versatile Land (grade 1, 2 or 3a). This has been minimised where possible within the Scheme.</p> <p>The focus of the Finch case cited by LCC (Ref 1-2) is on ‘inevitable’ consequences and effects, in this case arguing that the downstream refinement and combustion of oil is an ‘inevitable’ effect of extracting oil at the site. The Applicant does not believe this test applies to the Scheme and lost food production here, it is not ‘inevitable’ that food will have to be imported as a result of the Scheme, particularly when considering the position of the UK government and policy on food security. In the Applicant’s Response to Written Submissions at Deadline 1 [REP2-007] and pages 111-112 of the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-028] it is clarified that land use change does not feature among the identified risks to UK food security, whereas climate change does. Pages 137 and 138 of the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-028] also addresses this point with reference to the recent decisions on the Gate Burton Energy Park [EN010131] and Cottam Solar Project [EN010133]. The Secretary of State determined in respect of those schemes that the cumulative loss of land to food production, which includes the Scheme, would be minor and would not impact on food security. Therefore, it is not necessary to undertake a GHG assessment of importing food as part of this assessment.</p> <p>The Finch case cited by LCC (Ref 1-2) makes no judgement on and does not consider the need to assess related or geographically proximate projects cumulatively when undertaking GHG assessments, so the IEMA guidance (Ref</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p>1-3) and Applicant's position remains that it is not necessary to consider the Scheme alongside other solar farms in Lincolnshire.</p> <p>However, the Applicant notes that if a cumulative assessment of the solar schemes in Lincolnshire was to be considered, they all play a role in decarbonising the grid in line with the UK's net zero targets and would achieve a significant beneficial cumulative impact on GHG emissions compared to the baseline where the projects do not go ahead.</p>
Q1.3.11	LCC	<p>Alleged Harm</p> <p>The Council's WR [REP2-012] states in part: "The Councils view is arguably there is no reason why a list of connected projects could not be drawn up upon sensible parameters and the clustering of solar schemes in Lincolnshire would form a sensible list for such an assessment, particularly given this is the list of projects considered for other cumulative effects." Could the Council please elaborate on this point and explain what it means when it suggests that a list of connected projects could be drawn up? Could the Council also please confirm whether it is alleging any harm in relation to Climate Change and if so, what harm and associated policy conflicts are there?</p>	<p>The Council is of the view that a list of projects that are connected in some way for the four projects in West Lindsey they are connected in that they share a cable route to either West Burton or Cottam Power Station and therefore have similar characteristics they are connected in this way. In the interrelationship that has been prepared for each project at examination stage has looked at a wide range of topics to consider the cumulative impacts of the 4 projects could look at in combination GHG impacts.</p> <p>Once this work has been undertaken it could be assessed and the Council could come to a view if there is harm from the combined GHG of all the schemes and then if this is contrary to policy. The Council does not consider that this cumulative impact assessment has been undertaken so is not in a position to confirm if harm and consequently policy conflict exists.</p>	<p>As set out in Section 18.8 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [REP3-016], the global atmosphere is the receptor for climate change impacts and has the ability for holding GHG emissions. Regardless, as stated by IEMA guidance (Ref 1-3), all GHG emissions are considered significant and therefore would contribute to climate change. While the impact of any individual scheme may be limited, it is the cumulative impact of many schemes over time that could have a significant impact on climate change.</p> <p>As such it is not possible to define a study area for the assessment of cumulative effects of GHG emissions, nor to undertake an all-encompassing cumulative effects assessment, as the identified receptor is the global climate and effects are therefore not geographically constrained. Consequently, as stated in the IEMA guidance (Ref 1-3), effects of GHG emissions from specific cumulative projects should not be individually assessed, as there is no basis for selecting any particular (or more than one) cumulative project that has GHG emissions for assessment over any other.</p> <p>Overall, the Scheme will deliver a beneficial, significant effect on GHG emissions, due to the substantial emissions reductions the Scheme will achieve in comparison to the without-project baseline (i.e. in a scenario where the Scheme does not go ahead and the power it would generate is provided by a fossil fuel generating station). Therefore, the Scheme will not contribute to any significant adverse effect on climate change. If a cumulative assessment of the solar schemes in Lincolnshire was to be considered, they all play a role in decarbonising the grid in line with the UK's net zero targets and would achieve a significant beneficial cumulative impact on GHG emissions compared to the baseline where the projects do not go ahead.</p>
Q1.7.1	LCC	<p>Assets scoped out</p> <p>ES paragraph 8.9.7 [APP-039] states: "The DBA identified assets which would not experience any impacts or effects as a result of the construction, operation, or decommissioning of the Scheme and were scoped out of assessment within this ES</p>	<p>The Council have concerns regarding certain aspects of the assessment methodology. Specifically, the methodology does not adequately consider the group value of historic farmsteads within the scheme area. These assets collectively contribute to the historic character, setting, and significance of the landscape, and their potential harm from the development warrants further consideration within the ES. Additionally, the valuation method applied to historic farmsteads appears overly selective and reductive. The</p>	<p>The Relevant Representations from LCC [RR-165] note that they welcome the approach and methodology set out in the DBA (Appendix 8-2: Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment of the ES [APP-059]), stating they "Agree with much of the assessment for built heritage set out in the ES. This includes the decision to scope several farmsteads from the DBA to the ES." The Applicant provided detailed responses to the comments received in LCC's Relevant Representation [RR-165] on non-designated historic farmsteads at pages 89 to 99 of the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-028].</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		Chapter.” Are LCC, NCC and/ or Historic England (HE) satisfied with the approach taken and the identified assets which have been scoped out?	binary classification of non-designated historic farmsteads as having 'low value' fails to account for their cumulative significance or their contribution to the broader landscape character. This approach risks underestimating the potential adverse effects on this predominant class of assets within the scheme area. A more nuanced assessment that considers both individual and collective value would provide a more accurate understanding of the potential impacts.	The Applicant met with LCC’s historic environment officers on 6 December 2024 to further discuss comments on historic farmsteads and explained to LCC that the Applicant has considered the collective contribution of historic farmsteads as part of the historic landscape assessment. Further details on the historic landscape assessment were provided in response to Question 1.7.5 within Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062] .
Q1.7.3	LCC	<p>Corringham Windmill Setting</p> <p>The ES [APP-039] considers the effect of the Proposed Development on Corringham Windmill (Grade II listed building) at paragraphs 8.9.82 to 8.9.89. In considering the setting of the building, ES Paragraph 8.9.85 states in part: “Its setting, which has been diminished by the loss of the mill buildings which contributed to its value and understanding, comprises the field in which it is located alongside the road and relationship to Corringham”.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the historic function of the building, is the Applicant, WLDC and LCC confident that its setting is confined to “the field in which it is located alongside the road and relationship to Corringham” as asserted in the ES?</p>	The proposed development will harm the setting of Corringham windmill by altering its southeastern views, transitioning them from a rural landscape to a semi-industrial character. This change adversely affects the ability to interpret the historic function of the windmill and its relationship to the surrounding landscape. The Council recommend the applicant consider further setbacks to the solar array to reduce the potential harm to this heritage asset	Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-039] includes an assessment of the Grade II listed Corringham Windmill [NHLE 1359417]. The presence of the Scheme would alter the existing views from the windmill structure, although mitigated by the hedgerow planting in the longer-term, and change the landscape to the south-east from agriculture to one that is semi-industrial with the introduction of solar panels and infrastructure. Views of the solar panels may be visible above the hedgerows between the fields and road towards the Scheme from the asset, as illustrated by VP20 taken east of the windmill (depicted on Figure 12-12a of the ES [APP-184]). The change to the wider setting of the windmill caused by the presence of the Scheme was assessed as a very low magnitude of impact that would have no appreciable impact on its value, entailing slight changes in how the asset is experienced and appreciated, taking into account that little of the original features of the windmill remain and its immediate setting has been diminished due to the demolition of other associated mill buildings. The impact on the asset’s wider setting is assessed as a negligible effect that is not significant, equating to less than substantial harm. This conclusion for the assessment is supported by the response from WLDC to Q.1.7.3 set out further below in this table.
Q1.7.10	LCC	<p>Survey extent – cable route</p> <p>LCC has noted that further archaeological survey work is required along parts of the cable route [RR-165]. The Applicant has identified that certain areas of the cable route have not been surveyed where it 'has not been possible' to access individual land parcels (ES Table 8-5 [APP-039]). What is the Applicant’s/ LCC’s / NNC’s latest position on whether sufficient archaeological investigation has been carried out?</p>	LCC and NCC understand that there are access issues but are confident that the Applicant will undertake the work as soon as it is possible and certainly in advance of the construction programme. The results of this late stage of evaluation will need to inform the mitigation strategy.	The Applicant notes this response. The Applicant’s full response is set out within Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP6-062] . In summary, the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP1-025] sets out a staged approach to archaeological mitigation measures, Stage 1 comprises ‘ <i>archaeological trial trench evaluation of a small number of areas within the Principal Site and Cable Route Corridor for the Tillbridge Solar Scheme where non-intrusive archaeological survey (e.g. geophysical survey, aerial photography and LiDAR assessment) has identified a potential for possible archaeological remains and which have not previously been accessible</i> ’. This will ensure any remaining surveys undertaken will inform archaeological mitigation measures, as requested.

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
Q1.7.12	LCC	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>Are LCC and NCC satisfied that dDCO Requirement 11 [REP1-057] is sufficient to ensure that the mitigation outlined at ES Section 8.10 is delivered effectively? In relation to this point, do the Councils and the Applicant consider that the dDCO makes provision/ controls the “coordinated programme of archaeological investigation and mitigation” for the cable route, as suggested in ES Paragraph 18.9.5 [APP-49]?</p>	<p>LCC and NCC are satisfied that we will come to an agreement regarding the mitigation strategy with the Applicant and that the outstanding evaluation results for the cable route will inform that part of the mitigation strategy. We do however recommend that the current proposed Requirement wording for section (1) be amended from ‘the mitigation strategy’ to ‘the archaeological mitigation strategy agreed with the relevant local planning authorities and Historic England.’</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the Councils’ response regarding the mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider the amendment to Requirement 11 suggested by LCC and NCC is necessary given the existing provisions within the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)]. Requirement 11 refers to the “<i>archaeological mitigation strategy</i>”, which is defined under article 2 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] as the plan of the same name identified in Schedule 13 (documents and plans to be certified). The document listed in Schedule 13 is the version of the archaeological mitigation strategy that has been agreed by the local planning authorities and Historic England. The change sought is therefore superfluous and would duplicate the drafting already included in the draft DCO.</p>
Q1.7.13	LCC	<p>Viking Winter Camp</p> <p>In relation to the Winter Camp of the Viking Great Army, the Planning Statement Appendix C Paragraph 5.1.4 [AS-029] states in full: “The construction of the Scheme has the potential to result in the disturbance or loss of a small section of surviving archaeological remains, if they survive within the Order limits. This will cause harm to the significance of the asset, but, given the location of the impact towards the periphery of the winter camp and not within the core of settlement activity, as it is currently understood, that harm will be less than substantial with the asset’s heritage significance not being significantly lost or altered.” Is LCC satisfied with this conclusion and the basis upon which it has been reached?</p>	<p>LCC is not satisfied that this will cause less than substantial harm. There is no evidence put forward to support such a statement. Torksey Viking Winter Camp is a unique and incredibly important historic and archaeological site and any damage whatsoever to it is substantial harm. The nature of the site is such that there is potential for archaeology of national and even international importance may be found and impacted anywhere across the site.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.4.88 to 4.4.92 of the Historic Environment desk-based assessment Appendix 8-2: Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment of the ES [APP-059] describe the non-designated heritage asset the Winter Camp of the Viking Great Army [MLI125067] and summarise the evidence recorded during surveys undertaken by the Torksey Viking Project; notably geophysical surveys completed in 2012. The significance of the heritage asset was assessed at paragraphs 5.5.95 and 5.5.96 of Appendix 8-2 of the ES [APP-059], identifying its potential national significance. The geophysical surveys completed by the Torksey Viking Project in 2012 extended across several areas within and in close proximity to the mapped extent of the Winter Camp of the Viking Great Army. Magnetometer survey Area A, which is located within the Cable Route Corridor, north of and outside of the extent of the Winter Camp of the Viking Great Army [MLI125067] mapped by the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record (HER), identified anomalies of archaeological origin including a large, probable boundary or enclosure ditch, numerous sub-circular and sub-rectangular anomalies likely representing pits or sunken feature structures, evidence for medieval ridge and furrow agriculture and possible post-medieval field boundary ditches. Magnetometer survey Area B which extended into the extent of the Viking Great Army [MLI125067] mapped by the Lincolnshire HER and part the Order Limits for Cable Route Corridor Access 6 from the A156, revealed no anomalies that could be interpreted as archaeological in origin.</p> <p>Neither the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN1 (Ref 1-1) or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ref 1-4) state that any harm to a designated heritage asset e.g. a scheduled monument, automatically equates to substantial harm. The NPS EN1 (Ref 1-1) (at paragraph 5.9.31) and the NPPF (Ref 1-4) (paragraph 214) refer to “...<i>substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset...</i>”. Substantial harm would therefore equate to the significant partial, or total, loss of a heritage asset or, its heritage significance. In the case of the Winter Camp Viking Great Army, this</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p>would equate to the loss of key elements of its archaeological or historic interest from which its heritage significance is largely derived.</p> <p>Both Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723 of the Planning Practice Guidance (Ref 1-5), Historic Environment and paragraph 27 of Historic England’s Good Practice Advice Note 2 (Ref 1-6) emphasise that substantial harm is a high test which may not arise in many cases.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.9.30 of NPS EN1 (Ref 1-1) states that “<i>Substantial harm to or loss of significance of assets of the highest significance, including Scheduled Monuments; Protected Wreck Sites; Registered Battlefields; grade I and II* Listed Buildings; grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens; and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional</i>”.</p> <p>In the case of the Winter Camp Viking Great Army, its potential national significance is acknowledged, and it was treated in the Harm Statement as being equivalent to a Scheduled Monument. As noted in the Heritage Harm Statement (Appendix C of the Planning Statement [REP3-027]) the proposed works for Cable Route Corridor Access 6 would include excavation to create a temporary access road and associated drainage in a working corridor 6m wide, across a 310m length (a total area of 0.186 ha) of northern periphery of the 26 ha area recorded as comprising the Winter Camp Viking Great Army heritage asset by the Lincolnshire HER.</p> <p>The potential physical impact to the asset would affect a small part of its known extent, resulting in the potential loss or disturbance of any surviving archaeological remains within the narrow corridor of Cable Route Corridor Access 6, which represents a very small part of the larger asset, with the majority of the buried archaeological remains, i.e. the key elements of the special archaeological interest, which comprise the asset, surviving undisturbed beyond the Order limits. On this basis it is considered that the Winter Camp of the Viking Great Army [MLI125067] would retain the majority of its archaeological and historic interest and consequently any loss of its heritage significance would be minor. The Heritage Harm Statement (Appendix C of the Planning Statement [REP3-027]) reflects this rationale when asserting that “<i>that harm will be less than substantial with the asset’s heritage significance not being significantly lost or altered.</i>”</p>
Q1.7.14	LCC	Could the statutory parties please provide representations in relation to the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP1-025] submitted by the Applicant?	Following consultation by the applicant in September 2024 LCC provided comments (also with NCC) to the Applicant on the draft AMS which the Council understand have been captured in the latest version of the AMS (REP1-025) which is expected to be submitted at Deadline 3.	The Applicant considered the comments provided by LCC and NCC and revised the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) appropriately prior to its submission at Deadline 1. The AMS [REP1-025] therefore incorporates the comments received from LCC and NCC. The agreement of the contents of the AMS with LCC and NCC is presented within the Statement of Common Ground with Lincolnshire County Council [EN010142/APP/9.9(Rev01)] and Statement of Common Ground with Nottinghamshire County Council [EN010142/APP/9.10(Rev02)] .

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
Q1.8.2	LCC	<p>What are LCC's and in particular their Fire and Rescue Services views on the adequacy and provisions within the Battery Safety Management Plan and the resources and access arrangements proposed? Does the proposal align with the National Fire Chief Councils guidance to Fire and Rescue Services on Grid Scale BESS? Ref: 6.1 Chapter 10 Water Environment & Framework Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-225].</p>	<p>The details appear to capture all of the requirements as per the NFCC guidance. The Council are happy with the content, recognising that there are caveats in-line with updated guidance from the NFCC and more specific details on water supplies and locations.</p> <p>Early engagement has outlined LFR's requirements and expectations. The Council are conscious that the provision of water will need to be integrated within the site design. Requirements as per the NFCC guidance need to be considered and adhered to, but the Council are happy to work with developers to consider location and access etc. Firefighting operations are developing all of the time, so would need to gain access to the water supplies from a safe distance from the BESS involved and would then adopt a defensive firefighting tactic. We have made these requirements clear to the developer. At this stage we need to do further work with the developer to ensure adequate water provision is considered.</p> <p>In relation to site access we have made the following observations: The access ladder platform can reach 32m high and would be used for incident observation / thermal imaging and in conjunction with main jets for application of water from height – how would this fit with the BESS sites and the overhead power lines? Access may be OK but operation is another consideration. Its noted that the access roads are 4m wide, which would not enable two-way traffic for HGV type vehicles. From early drawings it appears that access / turning is facilitated by using the road around the BESS compound. Assurance is required on the size of vehicles planned are based on, as the junctions do not appear to be HGV enabled.</p>	<p>The Applicant has drafted the Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (FBSMP) [EN010142/APP/7.13(Rev01)] to fully align with NFCC guidelines published in 2023 (Ref 1-7).</p> <p>The NFCC issued a consultation document containing draft revisions in July 2024, the official revised guidelines are likely to be published in January 2025. The Applicant will draft additional content or amendments which can be included in the FBSMP to fully align with any new NFCC guidelines, once these have been published.</p> <p>From the Applicant's engagement with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Services (LFR), the Applicant understands that the LFR is satisfied with the FBSMP, and the Applicant is continuing engagement with LFR on details of their preferred layout for LFR vehicle access to the indicative BESS-Solar Station Compounds for emergency response access. The Applicant has produced is tweaking the designs for the BESS-Solar Station Compounds and their access based on LFR feedback with the expectation that the final indicative design for Compound Vehicle access is agreed in February 2025.</p> <p>In respect of these design adjustments to reflect LFR input, the Applicant can confirm that BESS-Solar Station Compounds will not be sited in areas with overhead power lines that would restrict incident observation platform use. Operational protocols will be established to ensure that incident observation and thermal imaging activities are conducted without interference from the site infrastructure, prioritising both safety and functionality. The access roads will include passing bays at regular intervals, ensuring safe and efficient two-way vehicle movements. The turning radius of the roads has been designed at this time with a minimum of 12.5m, which is compatible with the manoeuvrability requirements of LFR Vehicles according to the details provided. Additionally, vehicle tracking will be undertaken during the detailed design stage to confirm and refine the adequacy of the access routes and turning areas. The Applicant has also confirmed that as per current NFCC guidelines a minimum of 2 hours water supply at 1,900 litres per minute will be provided for each BESS-Solar Station Compound. These matters are captured in the current draft of the Framework BSMP [EN010142/APP/7.13(Rev01)], and otherwise will be reflected in the final detailed designs as prepared post consent.</p>
Q1.8.5	LCC	<p>Control of Major Accident Hazards</p> <p>What are the associated risks arising from the potential increase in the Glentworth K oil site within the principal site boundary? Ref: 6.1 Chapter 17 Other Environmental Topics [APP-048].</p>	<p>Reference in this document is made to the existing Glentworth K site and that the developer has been contacted to ensure sufficient offsets from the safeguarded Glentworth K Oil site have been incorporated within the Scheme design. However no mention is made to the recently granted extension to the K site which is some 500m west of the existing Glentworth K site and measures have been put in place to safeguard this recently approved extension. There is an example of a solar development been adjacent to another oil production site in the County which operate without any</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a response to this question in the Applicant's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP3-062]. The Applicant has considered the recently granted planning permission for a new oil well site located to the west of the existing Glentworth N. 1 (K) site (under planning ref. PL/0135/22) as set out in the REP3-027]. The Order limits exclude both the existing Glentworth K oil site and the site of the proposed new oil well site. The Applicant also updated the Outline Design Principles Statement [EN010142/APP/7.4(Rev03)] at Deadline 3 to confirm that no Works No. 2(a) and (b) as shown in the Works Plans [REP2-004], which relate to BESS, will not be located within 30m of the existing Glentworth K oil site and</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			issues. The only difference from this existing arrangement is that the solar development does not include a BESS and so provided the BESS is some distance from the oil site and any expansion would be closer to the designated BESS area it is not considered that this should present any risks.	<p>the area granted planning permission under ref. PL/0135/22 to construct a hydrocarbon wellsite, to minimise risk of impact from a fire or explosion from within the Scheme. With these measures in place, it is considered that the risk of impact from a fire or explosion on the established Glentworth K oil site and the proposed new site has been minimised, so that no significant risks remain.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the existing Glentworth N.1 (K) oil well site is not a COMAH site and therefore not subject to the COMAH regulations. This demonstrates that the established use is therefore of low risk in terms of the need to control major accidents. Similarly, Works No. 2(a) and (b) forming part of the Scheme are also not subject to the COMAH regulations.</p> <p>Through the control measures described above, the Applicant has confirmed that Work No. 2 (a) and (b) will not have an adverse impact on the operation of both the established and proposed oil well site in terms of operation and in relation to health and safety matters.</p>
Q1.9.11	LCC	<p>New Bridleway Update</p> <p>ES Paragraph 12.6.17 [APP-043] states:</p> <p>“At the time of ES preparation, an application to claim a new bridleway has been submitted to LCC, reinstating a section of the historic ‘low’ route along the base of the Cliff between Harpswell and Glentworth, parallel to Middle Street.”</p> <p>Can LCC and the Applicant please provide an update?</p>	<p>There are two DMMO applications for this route over the same land. One submitted in 2014 (DMMO371) and one in 2024 (DMMO843).</p> <p>The Council have already determined DMMO371 and have made an Order in 2023 to add the bridleway to the definitive map, please see the attached order. This order has received objections and has been sent to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) for determination. It was sent on 31st May 2024 (Ref: ROW/3345516). It is currently in the initial validation stage at PINS.</p> <p>The Council doubts that it will have been resolved by April 2025, but the timescale is in the hands of PINS so the Council cannot guarantee when they will look at it. It is anticipated that the decision for DMMO371 will also resolve the application made for DMMO843</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that while the claimed Glentworth and Harpswell Public Bridleway route, which the two DMMO applications relate to, is not yet formally confirmed, it has still been assessed as a definitive route within the ES, specifically within Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)], Chapter 14: Socioeconomics and Land Use [APP-045] and Chapter 16: Transport and Access [APP-047] of the ES. It is also included within the Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP3-041], Framework Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (FLEMP) [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] and Schedule 6, Part 4 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] as set out below.</p> <p>The Framework Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (FLEMP) [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] forms part of the Application and provides a framework for achieving the outline design, as presented in Figure 3-1: Indicative Principal Site Layout Plan of the ES [AS-055]. Paragraph 1.2.11 of the FLEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] acknowledges the presence of the claimed route confirming that works are only proposed for mitigation and enhancement in this area. The Scheme design has considered the claimed route as though it has been confirmed to ensure that should it be confirmed both the Scheme and claimed PRoW can coexist. The land subject to the DMMO is not proposed for development comprising mitigation and enhancement land for biodiversity and archaeology. Further controls are also built into the Scheme through the Works Plans [REP2-004] which only authorise Work No. 9 (habitat management and protection) and 11 (sensitive archaeological site) in this area. These works relate to the provision of green infrastructure and comprise no built areas. The works packages in Schedule 1 of the DCO can only be constructed within the corresponding areas shown on the Works Plans [REP2-004] meaning the areas for ecological enhancement and the archaeological sensitive sites are fixed parameters. In addition, should the claimed route be confirmed, the Framework Public Right of Way</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p>Management Plan [REP3-041] includes measures to manage the claimed route during construction should this be required (paragraph 3.1.15). The temporary management of the claimed PRoW should it be confirmed is further secured and shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-005] (PRoW – 4/01 and 4/02 of sheet 4 of 24).</p> <p>As such, if the DMMO applications are approved, this would not change the conclusions of the ES.</p>
Q1.9.18	LCC	<p>Effect of mitigation planting</p> <p>LCC LIR paragraph 5.14 [REP1A-001] states in part: “This reduced to three receptors or viewpoints experiencing significant residual effects at year 15 which suggests a potential over reliance upon mitigation planting to screen the proposals without full attention to the potential impact of this screening on the landscape.”</p> <p>Could LCC please explain the rationale for the conclusion that there is an over reliance on mitigation planting and clarify what this means in terms of the effects. Could the Applicant please provide a response to paragraph 5.14?</p>	<p>The comment in LCC LIR paragraph 5.14 [REP1A-001] relates to planting to mitigate the visual effects of the development. The Council accept that planting can be an effective way to screen development proposals, however this needs to be carried out in a way that is sensitive to the existing landscape character, or meet any aims of a published character assessment to improve or introduce new planting to an area. LCC wish to clearly identify that while residual visual effects have been assessed as reducing at 15 years through mitigation planting, this is completely dependent upon the successful establishment of the planting and it growing in a manner that is anticipated within the LVIA, and illustrated on the accompanying visualisations. This is always going to be a risk, and if the planting does not establish as anticipated, the residual effects will likely be higher than judged.</p> <p>The success and effectiveness of planting to mitigate (screen) proposals is very much dependent upon a successful planting and subsequent establishment period, where appropriate plant species are installed to recognised horticultural standards and practices, maintained over an appropriate establishment period, which we would expect to last to the residual phase of the LVIA (15 years) as a minimum, and any plant failures over this period are replaced. This should be appropriately covered in the oLEMP.</p> <p>The overall character of the area is relatively open, and too much planting without due care for location, simply to screen could have detrimental impacts. The PROW and local roads in the study area enjoy an open aspect across some areas of the study area, for example along the ridge at the eastern Site extents where there are extensive long-range views south across the Site (as illustrated on VP4) or along the A631 (VP1) along the northern extents. Therefore, care needs to be taken to prevent the loss of this character through an overbearing set of mitigation proposals. It is noted</p>	<p>Principles for the establishment of this mitigation are secured through the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)]. The Framework LEMP details in paragraphs 8.3.12 (regarding native hedgerow planting) and 8.3.20 (regarding native woodland, shrub with trees, woodland edges and traditional orchard planting), the following:</p> <p><i>“Dead, dying or diseased planting will be subject to removal where they are considered dangerous on health and safety grounds or as a result of their state of health fail to fulfil the intended mitigation function, and in accordance with any protected species constraints. In such circumstances the removed planting will be replaced with the same specification of planting (species and size) except in the event that it is deemed that the plants are failing due to local conditions or prevailing issues with disease for example. In such circumstances the landscape architect would specify an alternative specification of native species that is better able or suited to the conditions observed on site and fulfils the same function as those species removed, both in terms of their ecological, landscape and visual function and benefit. Such species would then be managed in line with the first 5 years of establishment set out in this document.”</i></p> <p>As stated in Paragraphs 8.3.27 (regarding native hedgerows) and 8.3.30 (regarding native woodland, shrub with trees and woodland edges), the requirement for checking/replacement of failed or defective plans as part of long-term management beyond the 5-year establishment period, will be set out in the subsequent iteration of the final LEMP, in accordance with Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)], as outlined below.</p> <p>Given the above, the Applicant confirms that the success and effectiveness of planting as mitigation will be monitored and re-established if it has not been successful.</p> <p>Furthermore, and recognising the importance of establishing timely mitigation screening, Paragraph 8.2.8 of the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] states that whilst planting stock of UK origin and provenance will be preferred, there may be need to consider climate change adaption and genetic variation as resilience to biosecurity threats.</p> <p>Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] provides that a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) must be submitted to and</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>that appropriate development offsets, and with careful design, will go some way to address the matter raised. However, VP2b from Common Lane west of Harpswell is an example of where the development has foreshortened the open view, and while planting is shown to screen the development, the view is ultimately changed by the mitigation planting.</p>	<p>approved by the relevant planning authority (/authorities) before works can commence on the Scheme. The LEMP is required to be substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], meaning that any landscape and ecological mitigation measures included in the Framework LEMP (which was submitted as part of the DCO Application) and the measures contained therein that were considered in the assessment of landscape and visual effects presented in Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] must be reflected in the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan(s).</p> <p>With reference to potential detrimental impacts on the open nature of the area, the Applicant has previously acknowledged the balance of screening the development versus the loss of these open aspects. However, the Applicant does not consider that there will be any loss of openness for PRoW, given that only a single PRoW (Gltw/85/1, south of Kexby Road) is located within the Principal Site, which (with reference to the Indicative Principal Site Layout Plan (Figure 3-1 of the ES [APP-128]) is located within a proposed Biodiversity Zone. No new hedge and tree planting is proposed parallel to this section of PRoW and views will remain open.</p> <p>The Applicant accepts that there will be a loss of openness through proposed infill hedge planting and management of existing hedges at greater height along the A631; and new planting along a section of the B1398 Middle Street; but maintains that in both cases, sensitivity of receptors and therefore the resulting level of visual effects is reduced due to these roads not being considered attractive to slow-moving, recreational receptors.</p> <p>Similarly, the Applicant accepts that there will a loss of openness along the unclassified road Common Lane through the centre of the Principal Site. However, sections of this same road to the west are characterised by dense hedging. Although, as stated, there will be a loss of the open view for Viewpoint 2b, the Applicant notes that the woodland and dense hedgerow immediately to the north, which blocks views in this direction, were planted—based on a review of historic aerial maps—around the year 2000, alongside other areas of woodland between Common Lane and the A631. For these reasons, it is considered that such features are not without precedent and the loss of such views in this instance would not be significant. Moreover, the dominant character along this section of Common Lane is one of agricultural intensification and it may be argued that, ordinarily, the introduction or enhancement of hedgerows in this type of landscape would be regarded as beneficial. The character of Common Lane would be more analogous to Willingham Road and Fillingham Lane, a similar east-west rural route approximately 3.2 km to the south.</p>
Q1.13.11	LCC	FCTMP Paragraph 9.11 of LCCs LIR [REP1A-001] states in part: “The	The Council is in dialogue with the applicant on this matter and recently held a meeting to discuss such matters. The Council is waiting to see the applicant’s response at DL3 but	The Applicant is discussing the content of the Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] with the Council, however wishes to emphasise that the point made in the Council’s LIR about the Framework CTMP

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (ES Vol 7) needs to be captured as a requirement rather than a standalone document.' However, Requirement 14 of the draft DCO [APP-014] relates to the FCTMP [REP1-021]. Could the Council please confirm the acceptability or otherwise of this requirement/approach to securing the FCTMP?	is expected to be in agreement with the Council's approach to capturing this.	[EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] being captured as a requirement is already addressed within the DCO requirements and has been included on that basis since the application version of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] .
Q1.14.3	LCC	Storage of water for firefighting is proposed to meet the requirements of the NFFC guidance but is there an additional allowance for storage for the integral firefighting and sprinkler systems proposed for the BESS or does this eat into the fire fighters allowance and is there a risk that the supply for attending fire fighters is partially used or exhausted by the time of their arrival? Ref: 6.1 Chapter 10 Water Environment [APP-041].	Storage of water for firefighting is proposed to meet the requirements of the NFFC guidance but is there an additional allowance for storage for the integral firefighting and sprinkler systems proposed for the BESS or does this eat into the fire fighters allowance and is there a risk that the supply for attending fire fighters is partially used or exhausted by the time of their arrival - Any BESS fire suppression systems must conform to NFPA 855 (2023) guidelines. Guidelines outline that there should be a separate water supply for the internal water suppression systems	The Applicant has provided a response to this comment in the Applicants Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP3-062] . The Applicant wishes to further clarify that any automatic fire suppression system integrated into BESS enclosures will conform to NFPA 855 (2023) standards, this is stipulated in Section 7.6.2 of the Framework Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010142/APP/7.13(Rev01)] .
Q1.15.1	LCC	Glentworth K Oil Site Paragraphs 12.6 and 12.7 of the Council's LIR [REP1A001] refer to the effect of the Proposed Development on the operation of the Glentworth K Oil site. Please could the Council confirm its current position on the effect on this site, with reference to relevant policies?	<p>Policy M12 - Safeguarding of Existing Mineral Sites and associated Minerals Infrastructure of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2016) states:- "Mineral sites and associated infrastructure that supports the supply of minerals in the County will be safeguarded against development that would unnecessary sterilise the sites and infrastructure or prejudice or jeopardise their use by creating incompatible land uses nearby".</p> <p>The policy provides a list of those activities which are exempt from this policy. The proposed development is not listed and therefore does not benefit from an exemption.</p> <p>An explanatory paragraph of the Policy notes the future use of mineral sites and associated development could be constrained if sensitive developments such as residential development are permitted nearby, Within a 250m buffer zone around the mineral site the County Council may advise that development should not be permitted if it would</p>	<p>Policy M12 of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Ref 1-9) relates to 'Existing Mineral Sites and Associated Minerals Infrastructure', and explanatory paragraph 5.98 of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan explicitly states that "<i>the sites and facilities to be safeguarded are listed in Appendix 2 and shown on Figures 6-12 in Appendix 3</i>". The existing Glentworth K oil site is listed in Appendix 2 and shown on Figure 6, and the Applicant has acknowledged that the existing Glentworth K oil site is safeguarded by policy M12 in paragraph 6.15.9 of the Planning Statement [REP3-027]. The proposed site for a new oil extraction facility with extant planning permission (ref. PL/0135/22) is not however listed in Appendix 2 or Figures 6-12 of Appendix 3 of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, nor is it located adjacent to the existing site and would not be classed as associated development. Although the proposed site has planning permission, no conditions have been discharged and no work has started on site. Therefore, the proposed oil extraction site (ref. PL/0135/22) is not afforded the same protection in policy terms as an existing and established safeguarded mineral site with no requirement to comply with Policy M12.</p> <p>In terms of LCC's comments relating to explanatory paragraph 5.100 of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, this states that LCC have placed a</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>constrain the effective operation of existing or future use of land identified for mineral use.</p> <p>Provided the area within 250m of the site is only to be used to station solar panels and associated fencing of the mineral site it is not considered that the mineral site would be compromised by the proposed development and therefore not in conflict with Policy M12.</p>	<p>Minerals Consultation Area (MCA) on existing mineral sites and associated infrastructure safeguarded by Policy M12, including a 250m buffer zone around such sites. Paragraph 5.100 confirms that the 250m consultation zone means that local planning authorities should consult LCC on proposals for non-mineral development which could affect the use of mineral sites and associated development safeguarded by Policy M12 within this consultation zone, and that LCC may advise that development should not be permitted if it would constrain the effective operation of existing sites, or future use of land or associated infrastructure identified for mineral use.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed in paragraph 6.15.14 of the Planning Statement [REP3-027] that the Scheme would not constrain the effective operation of the existing Glentworth K oil site.</p> <p>The Applicant wishes to point out however that paragraph 5.100 relates to Town and Country Planning Applications (TCPA) which have been submitted to the District Council, and therefore does not directly relate to the Scheme as it is a DCO to be determined by the Secretary of State. However, the Applicant acknowledges that the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan may be important and relevant in relation to the Scheme and the Secretary of State may wish for LCC to confirm that they are content that the continued operation of existing safeguarded minerals sites will not be impacted by Scheme with any new use being compatible with the established use to ensure compliance with Policy M12. Despite the proposed oil extraction site (ref. PL/0135/22) not being safeguarded by Policy M12, as mentioned previously and in the Applicant’s Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH3 [EN010142/APP/9.34], the Applicant has treated the proposed site with the same weight and protection as the existing safeguarded Glentworth K oil site. The Scheme’s Order limits exclude both the existing Glentworth K oil site and the area subject to planning permission ref. PL/0135/22. The Applicant also updated the Outline Design Principles Statement [EN010142/APP/7.4(Rev03)] at Deadline 3 to confirm that Works No. 2(a) and (b) as shown in the Works Plans [REP2-004] will not be located within 30m of the existing Glentworth K oil site and the area granted planning permission under ref. PL/0135/22 to construct a hydrocarbon wellsite, to minimise the risk of impact from a fire or explosion from either within the Principal Site or within the Glentworth K oil site. With these measures in place, it is considered that the risk of impact from a fire or explosion on and from the Glentworth K oil site has been minimised, so that no significant risks remain. It is the Applicant’s view that following engagement with IGas (operator of the Glentworth K site) and adjustments made in relation to access, as well as the Applicant’s continued efforts to agree protective provisions with IGas, the previous discussions and agreed design changes referred to above are sufficient to ensure the continued operation of the existing and established Glentworth Oil site and would not prevent the operation of the new site should the applicant seek to implement planning permission PL/0135/22.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
Q1.15.5	LCC	<p>Waste Topic Paper</p> <p>Could LCC please provide a response to the 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-028] in relation to 'waste' at PDF pages 86-89 and the Waste Quantitative Cumulative Assessment at Appendix A?</p>	<p>Recycling (particularly PV panels)</p> <p>LCC welcomes the update of the Framework OEMP to commit to 70% diversion from landfill, and that the applicant's modelling of 70% recovery as a "realistic worst case" suggests that 'cumulative impacts would be not significant'. However, given that their "absolute worst case" (zero diversion) suggests that 'cumulative impacts would be significant', and in light of the lack of suitable recycling facilities/capacity for PV panels at present, the applicant will need to keep their findings under review during the lifetime of the project (for operational waste) and particularly as decommissioning approaches.</p> <p>Landfilling (particularly PV panels)</p> <p>Although LCC recognises that the assessment methodology uses landfill capacity, on a practical level the Council would query the assumption that any waste PV panels could go to landfill if not recycled. Given their nature as WEEE containing some hazardous elements, every effort should be made to avoid landfilling them. Whilst LCC will indeed continue to plan for sufficient landfill capacity, given the changing shape of the waste management industry, the long lifespan of the project, panels will reach end of life throughout the duration of the project and the nature of much of the waste arisings, this reinforces the need to keep waste management arrangements under review throughout the development lifetime.</p> <p>EMPs and RMPs</p> <p>LCC is satisfied with the applicant's explanation of how these documents, as framework and then full versions, will set out the applicant's waste management intentions for approval by LCC at the appropriate stages of the project.</p> <p>Operational Waste Management Plan (OWMP)</p> <p>LCC welcomes the addition to the Framework OEMP that the details we requested will be included in the OWMP.</p> <p>Study Area in Environmental Statement relating to waste management</p> <p>(p87/88) LCC welcomes the clarification that the use of England for hazardous and East Midlands for other waste aligns with Defra's 2010 Strategy as referenced. However, our expectation is that the applicant will try to conform to the proximity principle more closely wherever practicable.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the scenario of no waste management facilities being available across the whole of England and East Midlands for recycling waste streams from the Scheme is unrealistic and considers the 70% recovery from landfill being the realistic worst-case scenario. However, the Applicant agrees that waste management will be kept under review throughout operation and decommissioning. This will be documented as part of periodic reviews of the detailed OEMP throughout operation, as set out within Section 2.7 and Table 3-16 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)], and before decommissioning commences in the Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), as set out within Section 2.10 and Table 3-15 of the Framework DEMP [REP3-037].</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>Cumulative impacts</p> <p>Subject to our comments above regarding recycling and landfill capacity, LCC welcomes that the applicant has assessed the cumulative impacts of multiple similar projects which may be happening concurrently.</p>	
Q1.1.5	WLDC	<p>ES v LIR assessment</p> <p>Could WLDC please provide a Table setting out how the conclusions contained within its LIR [REP1A005] - with regard to the environmental effects of the Proposed Development - differ from those reached in the Applicant’s ES? This should also be included in the SoCG [REP1-042]. The Applicant is invited to undertake the same exercise and may wish to liaise with WLDC in this regard.</p>	<p>WLDC attach, as Appendix A to this submission, a table setting out the key planning impacts which also form the principal differences of opinion between the applicant and WLDC.</p> <p>To provide clarification, the LIR reports the impacts of the proposal as WLDC views them. This is based upon the ES conclusions, other supporting documents and the opinion of WLDC.</p> <p>In general terms, WLDC does not raise material objections to the EIA methodology, the manner in which assessments have been carried out or the judgements reached as reported in the ES.</p> <p>Where WLDC differs from the applicant, is the planning judgments reached when applying the impacts reported in the ES to the relevant policy framework. WLDC’s concerns therefore relate to a planning policy assessment as opposed to any fundamental criticism of the EIA or other application documents (all of which are considered equally important to WLDC).</p> <p>The table provided sets out the topic area, the matter of concern/objection and to which phase of the development those impacts relate.</p> <p>WLDC can confirm that the table has been shared and discussed with the applicant in draft form, and its content has been included in the recent draft of the Statement of Common Ground between the parties.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a response to WLDC’s Appendix A response to the Examining Authorities First Written Questions [REP3-066] at Appendix A of this document.</p> <p>It is noted that many comments in WLDC’s Appendix A response to the Examining Authorities First Written Questions remain the same as their comments in the LIR and relate to the methodologies, assessments and conclusions of the ES. Therefore, the Applicant has provided its responses to WLDC’s LIR again in Appendix A below, adding additional comments relating to planning policy and the planning balance where additional comments have been posed by WLDC.</p>
Q1.1.6	WLDC	<p>Cumulative construction period</p> <p>The WLDC LIR [REP1A-005] refers to a ‘decade’ long construction period (see for example paragraph 8.14). Could WLDC please explain how it has concluded that cumulative construction could take</p>	<p>WLDC’s concerns around the potential cumulative construction period is derived from the lifespan of the DCOs that have been granted or sought, and the estimated construction periods cited in the respective project ESs.</p> <p>The DCO lifespan being sought for projects is 5 years and the estimated construction period is 24 months, aside from</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and has provided a response to this question from the Examining Authority in the Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the table with potential cumulative construction periods provided within West Lindsey District Council’s Responses to the ExAs First Written Questions [REP3-067] does not align with the intended start</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		up to a decade, with specific reference to the Applicant's assertions to the contrary? Could the Applicant please provide a response as to whether a 10- year cumulative construction period is a realistic worse-case scenario?	<p>the Gate Burton Energy Park which cites a period of 24-36 months.</p> <p>Based upon these parameters for the 4 NSIPs either consented, at decision stage or in examination, plus the 5th NSIP due to be submitted shortly, a simple 'staggering' of development periods within the 5 year periods for each consents could lead to construction activity occurring up to 2033. There is no control over the commencement of construction aside from that it must do so within 5 years of the Orders coming into force.</p> <p>The table below helps demonstrate this potential scenario.</p> <p>To confirm, WLDC does not object to the cumulative assessment in the Tillbridge ES. This impact raised is simply highlighted a scenario that has the potential to happen within the scope of the DCOs being made.</p> <p>WLDC consider this period to be a significant length of time for residents to endure, and highlight the impact as one that should be considered negatively in the planning balance.</p>	<p>dates for the Applicant's and the other solar developer's construction periods, set out within Table 2-1 of the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-031]. As such, the Applicant does not consider a scenario where construction is staggered consecutively over 10 years is realistic, particularly where, as WLDC notes, construction for each project must commence within 5 years of the Orders coming into force (and it is presumed given the statutory timeframes that the Orders for each of the projects would come into force within 1-2 years of each other).</p> <p>With reference to the fifth NSIP, the Applicant understands from West Lindsey District Council's Responses to the ExAs First Written Questions [REP3-067] that this relates to One Earth Solar Farm which does not share the Cable Route Corridor with the other four NSIPs as the point of connection for that project is further south at National Grid substation at High Marnham. The Applicant provided a cumulative assessment with the One Earth Solar Farm, on the basis of information available for this project, within Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] but due to the distance of this project from the Scheme, no potential for cumulative effects with the Scheme was identified.</p> <p>Length of construction is not a consideration within NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1), NPS EN-3 Ref 1-10or NPS EN-5 Ref 1-11and does therefore not carry any weight in a planning balance. The Applicant has set out an appraisal of the Scheme against national and local planning policy in section 6, and Appendix A and B of the Planning Statement [REP3-027] and has also set out its position on the planning balance of the Scheme. Impacts that relate to construction, including cumulatively, are considered within this section based on the policy tests in the NPSs. The Applicant maintains that, in relation to construction, significant residual impacts to severance, pedestrian delay and non-motorised amenity on the B1241, North of Fleets Road should be afforded limited negative weight in the planning balance. As highlighted above, no significant cumulative effects have been identified in relation to construction, therefore there is limited weight in the planning balance.</p>
Q1.1.11	WLDC	<p>Good design</p> <p>All parties should be aware that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design was published on 23 October 2024. All parties (in particular the Applicant and Local Authorities) are invited to submit representations on the implications of the advice note. In addition, could the Applicant please explain whether, and if so how, the Application complies with this advice?</p>	<p>WLDC's understanding is that the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design (23/10/2024) is non-statutory, but applicants are advised to follow the recommendations. The Advice has been published to compliment legislation, regulations and other guidance published by the government (under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008).</p> <p>WLDC's view is that accordance with the Advice is integral to demonstrating compliance with legislation, regulations and relevant NPSs.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and has provided a response to this question from the Examining Authority in the Applicant's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>The Applicant's Design and Access Statement [AS-031] is where the Applicant has set out its design considerations and compliance with design policy and guidance, whereas the ES is focused on the environmental impacts of the Scheme based on relevant industry guidance.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>The Advice itself can also be considered an ‘important and relevant matter’ in to the context of section 104 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>WLDC is aware that the four high-level principles expressed within the National Infrastructure Commission ‘Design Principles for National Infrastructure’ document are referenced in the applicant’s Design and Access Statement, but have not seen reference elsewhere (e.g. within the ES).</p>	
Q1.7.3	WLDC	<p>Corringham Windmill Setting</p> <p>The ES [APP-039] considers the effect of the Proposed Development on Corringham Windmill (Grade II listed building) at paragraphs 8.9.82 to 8.9.89. In considering the setting of the building, ES Paragraph 8.9.85 states in part: “Its setting, which has been diminished by the loss of the mill buildings which contributed to its value and understanding, comprises the field in which it is located alongside the road and relationship to Corringham”. Bearing in mind the historic function of the building, is the Applicant, WLDC and LCC confident that its setting is confined to “the field in which it is located alongside the road and relationship to Corringham” as asserted in the EA</p>	<p>WLDC has not raised an objection to the scheme with regards to impacts on the Corringham Windmill cultural heritage asset or its setting.</p> <p>Having reviewed the ES, WLDC’s view is that the setting of the Corringham Windmill would be wider than just the field within which it is situated. Defining settings in such a precise or confined manner is not normally helpful or appropriate in assessing impacts. In this case, the Windmill would relate to the wider landscape within which it is interpreted. Notwithstanding the above view however, WLDC agrees with the impacts assessed in the ES. Even if a slightly wider setting were applied to the assessment, WLDC does not consider that it would materially alter the conclusions reached.</p>	<p>The Applicant’s response to the ExA question on the setting relating to Corringham Windmill was provided at Deadline 3 within Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062] in response to Q.1.7.3. The response by WLDC, agreeing with the overall conclusions of the Applicant’s assessment, is noted by the Applicant.</p>
Q1.9.21	WLDC	<p>Requirement 7 – OLEMP</p> <p>Paragraph 6.44 of WLDC’s LIR [REP1A-005] states in part: “WLDC does however maintain concerns around the cumulative approach and impacts upon the successful implementation of the OLEMP (e.g. within the cable corridor). More detail around how projects will be phased and mitigation delivered is required to avoid abortive implementation of measures, which could elongate the time period for when mitigation is delivered.” Could</p>	<p>The term ‘abortive implementation’ was used to describe a situation where a restoration scheme associated with cable construction in the shared corridor, is affected by the construction works of a later project constructing their cable in the same area.</p> <p>WLDC’s concern relates to the construction sequence of the projects cumulatively. Each project is able to construct at whatever stage it wishes in the construction period (as long as the project construction has commenced within the 5 year consent lifespan). In relation to the shared cable corridor, each project has the same order limits allowing them to construct anywhere within the defined area.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a response to this question from the Examining Authority in the Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>As set out within the Statement of Common Ground with Other Solar Developers [REP1-037], the four solar projects are currently in discussions regarding a further cooperation agreement. While the scope and content of this further agreement are still under discussion, it will likely relate to (amongst other things) how the four projects will work together in the discharge of their respective DCO requirements. This could include, but would not necessarily be limited to, the coordination of works, and restoration of landscaping, along the shared Cable Route Corridor.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		WLDC please expand on what it means with reference to 'abortive implementation' and set out what additional detail is required? Could the Applicant also respond to this point?	<p>This results in the potential for a project to construct and carry out restoration, only for the next project to then commence construction and affect that restoration.</p> <p>Should this situation occur, implemented restoration schemes for each project could be disturbed and their success compromised. The situation could also create difficulties in enforcement, as the lack of co-ordination between projects could prevent swift identification of parties responsible and those who remedy should be sought.</p> <p>Had the developers entered into a binding and enforceable mechanism to require co-ordination, this situation would not be such a concern for WLDC.</p>	
Q1.11.14	WLDC	<p>Tourism</p> <p>Paragraph 8.14 of the WLDC LIR [REP1A-005] states in full: "Notwithstanding the Applicant's assessment, WLDC has significant concerns regarding the potential impact upon the tourism industry, which would begin got be impacted through the influx of workers employed on a number of projects over a significant period of time (up to a decade)." Could WLDC please provide an explanation for this conclusion and identify what effect this would have (using EIA terminology)? Could the Applicant please respond to this point?</p>	<p>WLDC considers that there is potential for the proposal to have a negative impact upon the tourism economy within the West Lindsey District.</p> <p>The applicant's ES assesses the impacts of construction workers, adopting a study area of a 60 minute travel time from the site. WLDC does not object to the study area.</p> <p>WLDCs concern relates to potential cumulative impact of the Tillbridge Solar Project and the other solar developments within the district with regard to the use of tourist accommodation in the West Lindsey District to accommodate construction workers. The ES does not provide any assessment of the likely impact specifically within the West District; it only assesses capacity within the much wider 60 minute study area.</p> <p>If the cumulative impacts result in much of the accommodation available within West Lindsey being used to accommodate construction workers, WLDC has concerns that this would have an adverse impact upon the tourism sector. Should there be a significant reduction in the availability of accommodation for tourists, it can be assumed that visitors will look elsewhere beyond the District. Due to the potential lengthy cumulative construction period of a number of years, the ability for tourist accommodation businesses to recover once construction is complete is unknown and it is feared it would take significant time to do so. As set out in the LIR and WR, the tourist industry is already seeking to re-establish growth post-COVID, and</p>	<p>The Applicant has prepared a technical note with further clarification of the impacts of the Scheme and the cumulative schemes on visitor accommodation, which has been provided as Appendix C of Applicant's Response to Local Impact Reports [REP3-061]. A technical note on the Scheme's impacts on tourism was provided as Appendix D of Applicant's Response to Local Impact Reports [REP3-061]. No significant effects from the Scheme on its own or cumulatively with other developments has been identified.</p> <p>It is correct that the ES does not contain an assessment of capacity of the visitor accommodation sector within West Lindsey specifically, and it is noted that WLDC do not object to the 60-minute drive time being the appropriate Study Area for assessing such impacts. Selection of this Study Area for the consideration of economic and employment effects has been influenced by a recognition that larger centres of population will provide both a source of labour that the majority of the Scheme's immediate hinterland does not contain. It has also been influenced by the supply of accommodation in such areas being larger due to the typically higher prevalence of larger hotels in these areas, due to planning restrictions on density and scale in non-urban areas and increased presence of demand related to business travel. As explained at paragraph 14.6.16 of Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use [APP-045] accommodation information has been sourced from property resource, CoStar. This provides comprehensive information on the location of and size (no. of bedspaces) of visitor accommodation facilities across the UK.</p> <p>The choice of accommodation for non-home based workers during construction will ultimately be the remit of the Scheme and cumulative schemes' contractors, and identifying specific accommodation to be used is therefore not possible at the examination stage. However, using professional judgement and assumptions based on experience from other similar schemes, it is considered that their selection is likely to be influenced by practical considerations such as economies of scale associated with large block-bookings, and in respect of travel arrangements and trip generation, with larger facilities, closer to the road</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>eliminating accommodation for visitors could prolong this recovery.</p> <p>WLDC notes that the applicant states that the influx of workers to be positive to the tourism sector, however this does not appear to take account of the wider linked-industry benefits that tourism has. In visiting an area, tourists will naturally visit attractions in the area and spend within other hospitality and leisure facilities during their stay.</p> <p>As the ES or any other application document does not provide data specifically for the West Lindsey District, it is not possible to provide make a judgement in EIA terms or policy terms. Noting the methodology adopted by the applicant in the ES, 'adverse' classification indicates a 'disadvantageous or adverse effect on an area, which may be minor, moderate or major in effect'. The period of effect is also taken into account and calibrated as 'medium term' = 1-5 years and 'long term' = more than 5 years.</p> <p>Should the cumulative impact upon the availability of tourist accommodation for visitors be significantly reduced, and the cumulative construction period enduring for longer than 5 years, it may be concluded that such effects could be adverse and long term. This assessment could be carried out if the specific tourist accommodation data for the West Lindsey District can be provided.</p>	<p>network, being most attractive in these regards. Hotels larger than 100 rooms in size are considered to be the most likely source of supply to meet accommodation needs for construction of the Scheme. Based on a review of the underlying data from CoStar on accommodation referenced in Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use [APP-045], no hotels with greater than 100 rooms have been identified in West Lindsey. There is understood to be one hotel larger than 50 rooms in the district (Gainsborough, Travelodge, 52 rooms), with all other visitor accommodation being of less than 25 rooms.</p> <p>Overall, whilst it is not possible to specify the number of rooms in West Lindsey which would be used by the Schemes' contractors, the near complete lack of supply of facilities of optimal size makes it likely that no or very few rooms in the District would be used to accommodate workers. As such, no significant reduction in the availability of accommodation for tourists in West Lindsey is expected as a result of the Scheme or schemes cumulatively.</p>
Q1.13.12	WLDC	<p>FCTMP</p> <p>Paragraph 9.34 of WLDC's LIR [REP1a-005] states in full: "With regard to the mechanisms used to control construction traffic cumulatively with other projects however, WLDC has significant concerns regarding the lack of detail on how such impacts will be controlled." Could the Council please elaborate on this statement and provide information to clarify which details it thinks should be provided in the FCTMP [REP1-021]?</p>	<p>WLDC have, from the first solar NSIP examination within the district, wished to see a truly coordinated approach from the developers that is binding and enforceable. The reasoning behind this is there is currently no obligation through Development Consent Orders, to oblige developers to construct their respective projects in a collaborative and co-ordinated manner. The overlapping and concurrent construction activities will in WLDC's view, cause significant impacts in terms of construction traffic and the ability of communities and visitors to travel through the district. These impacts will be experienced over a number of years.</p> <p>WLDC note the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIP projects produced by the applicant and other developers. Unfortunately, this document does not serve to exert any control over joint activities to minimise impacts. The commitments within the document are not firmly made and</p>	<p>Primarily, the Applicant considers it would be inappropriate to implement a requirement in the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] for a joint CTMP, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section 120 of the Planning Act (Ref 1-12) provides that a DCO may impose requirements in connection with the development for which consent is granted. Such requirements may correspond with conditions which could have been imposed on the grant of planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Ref 1-13). In this regard, the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (Ref 1-4) and associated Planning Practice Guidance (Ref 1-5) concerning conditions generally apply. Requirements should therefore be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects.• The Applicant does not consider a requirement which enforces a Joint Cooperation agreement or Joint Management Plans would meet these standards, as no single party has authority over another and each DCO only controls the activities for that project. While Tillbridge Solar can endeavour to align management of works with the other developers, it cannot compel them to do so, and it cannot utilise the powers within their draft DCO unless

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>neither is the document secured through a DCO 'requirement'.</p> <p>This leaves the Framework Traffic Management Plan as the mechanism to control construction traffic. WLDC has suggested at each NSIP examination that a designated, single co-ordinator be established to independently manage construction traffic. They would be a point of reference for the LPAs, which would assist with monitoring and enforcement as they would hold knowledge of movements on any particular day.</p> <p>As Tillbridge represents the fourth solar project being considered on a cumulative basis, there is a clear need to control these impacts. The structure below provides WLDC's view on what a co-ordinated document could comprise. Had all applicants engaged and committed to genuinely minimise impacts on communities, a joint approach could have readily been achieved.</p> <p>Scope and objectives of the plan Explains the scope, purpose and objective of the plan, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The management of all freight traffic associated with two or more projects – heavy goods vehicles (HGVs), light goods vehicles (LGVs) and abnormal indivisible loads (AiLs)• The purpose is to prioritise the safe, efficient delivery of strategic cumulative (impacts associated with two or more solar generating station projects within West Lindsey District) construction traffic, whilst minimising delay to the travelling public and amenity impact on local communities.• Approach to reporting and public awareness (see below) <p>Construction traffic routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The identification of the defined construction traffic routes, as assessed in the project specific Environmental Statement, including the routes to be used by more than one solar generating station project during construction• An explanation of the appropriateness of the routes selected <p>Abnormal indivisible loads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To provide the details of quantum of AiL movements required and the cargo• To confirm details of the AiL routes	<p>specifically provided for by those undertakers. Any such requirement would therefore reach beyond the extent of the works within this Scheme being authorised, and as such would not be enforceable.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has included several mechanisms and measures for cumulative effects to be managed by the undertaker and directly by local authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Local highways authorities are able to manage cumulative effects through their permitting schemes for street works and traffic management, which the Applicant has included new drafting in its DCO to clarify. A primary purpose of these schemes is for highways authorities to be able to sequence traffic works within their broader area.• More broadly, the Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] includes consideration and management for cumulative effects, For example sections 7.1, 7.2 and 8.5 include specific provisions to require engagement with local authorities in respect of the timing of works and their sequencing between projects. The relevant planning authorities generally are required to review and approve the final plans prior to construction commencing, and in doing so could require the Applicant and other solar developers to better manage cumulative effects if they do not consider the existing plans appropriately address these.• Related to the above, the Applicant responded to comments made within WLDC's LIR on the Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] and its management of cumulative effects at paragraph 9.34 within Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Report [REP3-061]. This confirmed, as demonstrated within Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)], there would not be a significant adverse cumulative impact in transport terms, in the extremely unlikely event that the peaks of the four cumulative projects occur at the same time. Thus, there are no significant impacts requiring additional measures beyond what is already set out in the ES and existing Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] to control cumulative impacts, and the Applicant does not agree that additional controls are required to align the projects and their management of construction traffic.• If granted, the final Scheme must be constructed in accordance with the effects assessed for the Application. If it is considered that the effects are worse than those assessed, the Scheme will be required to ensure these are managed such that they are brought in line with the assessment, including in respect of cumulative impacts. The Applicant would need to confirm effects are no worse than those assessed in the Environmental Statement as part of the process for discharge of any requirements, pursuant to Schedule 17 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)]. <p>Notwithstanding this, as set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Other Solar Developers [REP1-037], the four solar projects are currently in discussions regarding a further cooperation agreement. While the scope and content of this further agreement are still under discussion, it will likely relate to</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirm any lay-down areas• Convoy sizes <p>Traffic management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Define the strategy for the delivery of construction traffic to serve more than one solar generating station project <p>Delivery times</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Define the appropriate cumulative construction traffic delivery times for each project• Confirm time when AiL trips are to occur (e.g. during daylight hours) <p>Public awareness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Production of a co-ordinated public awareness strategy for more than one project.• Designation of a single co-ordinator to manage construction traffic for each project. To be responsible for:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Liaising with each development project- Responsible for forward planning of activities and trips, and associated records for- LPAs/stakeholders- Responsible for dissemination of information (Websites/social media/emails etc) to the community ahead of cumulative activities- Notification of any potential delays on local roads <p>Highway improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Description of highway improvements required to facilitate delivery of construction component and general traffic• Identification of cumulative locations for improvement. <p>Structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Details of the assessment of all structures that may be subject to the gross vehicle weight of abnormal loads.• Identification of any strengthening measures required.• Identification of listed structures that may be affected.• Identification of any condition surveys required. <p>Environmental impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmation that cumulative traffic movements will be within the scope of the assessed EIAs• Confirmation/signposting of the relevant mitigation or each project	<p>(amongst other things) how the four projects will work together in the discharge of their respective DCO requirements. This could include, for example, the preparation and approval of a Joint CTMP – if all parties elect to do so and this is compatible with detailed design. The Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] specifically refers to the proposal to prepare a Joint CTMP between the four projects (see paragraph 1.3.4).</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			Monitoring, reporting and review <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explanation of the approach to the monitoring, reporting, and review of cumulative construction traffic	
Q1.15.6	WLDC	Minerals and Waste Could WLDC please expand on the conclusions at paragraph 18.1 (W2 and W3) of its LIR [REP1A-005], particularly given that these conclusions do not appear to be expanded on in the text in Section 18 of the LIR.	<p>The impacts identified at 18.1 in WLDC’s LIR relates to the likely potential impacts that could occur from the waste and recycling of infrastructure components replaced under the broad ‘maintenance’ clause in the dDCO. These concerns are also set out in WLDC’s WR at 5.35- 5.42.</p> <p>The concern relates to the approach to ‘maintenance’ as a power conferred by the draft order. The Tillbridge Solar Project (individually and cumulatively with other NSIP solar projects) have the ability to replace panels on a piecemeal basis across the 60 year lifetime of the project. Whilst keeping below the EIA thresholds for an individual replacement ‘event’ these can be repeated throughout the whole application lifespan.</p> <p>WLDC’s understanding is that panels could require replacement from approximately 20 years of use, and the BESS will also require a full replacement. It is also understood that there is insufficient capacity in West Lindsey, Lincolnshire or even the UK to recycle this material at the current time.</p> <p>The application documents do not provide any clarity on how replaced infrastructure will be dealt with. In the absence of any information relating to what recycling facilities may be delivered in the future, WLDC would welcome clarity on what the approach would be against the existing baseline.</p> <p>As all of the cumulative solar NSIPs are able to replace substantial amounts of solar panels and the BESS without any control or understanding of the potential impacts, WLDC maintain a significant concern that such activities could give rise to adverse environmental impacts, and impacts on communities.</p>	<p>The control mechanisms for the replacement of various solar infrastructure components during the operational phase of the Scheme are explained within Section 2.3 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)]. Furthermore, as set out within Table 3-16 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)], the waste hierarchy will be applied during the replacement of any infrastructure. Table 3-16 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)] commits to 70% diversion of waste from landfill. Waste management will be kept under review throughout operation and decommissioning. This will be documented as periodic reviews of the detailed OEMP through operation, as set out within Section 2.7 and Table 3-16 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)], and before decommissioning commences in the Decommissioning Resource Management Plan (DRMP), as set out within Section 2.10 and Table 3-15 of the Framework DEMP [REP3-037].</p> <p>Further clarification on the waste cumulative impact assessment was provided within Appendix A to the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-028], which included the consideration of a scenario where no waste management infrastructure is available. Although, the Applicant notes that the scenario of no waste management facilities being available across the whole of England and East Midlands for recycling waste streams from the Scheme is unrealistic and considers the 70% recovery from landfill being the realistic worst-case scenario.</p> <p>The study area for non-hazardous waste management is the East Midlands, the study area for hazardous waste management is England. Further information is provided in the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-028] (in response to the Environment Agency on pages 43-44) and within Appendix A of the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-028].</p>
Q1.15.9	WLDC	PoC Paragraph 6.28 of WLDCs Written Representation [RE2- 016] states in part “...whilst connection agreements are in place, what has not been confirmed in the	WLDC’s question seeks clarification on whether, as a consequence of the Tillbridge Solar Project in solus or cumulatively with other solar NSIPS, there is a need for new infrastructure (development) at the Point of Connection triggered by the solar farm projects.	As set out in paragraph 3.1.4 to 3.1.7 of the Applicant’s Grid Connection Statement [APP-214] , NGET has confirmed that an existing spare bay within the National Grid Cottam Substation is currently available. Works will be required as part of the Scheme to facilitate connection to the National Grid Cottam Substation and will be undertaken by the Applicant and National Grid.

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		application documents is whether there is existing capacity at the PoC to connect all of the projects, or the implications for all developments seeking to make connections within a similar timeframe.” Could WLDC please specify what effect is alleged here, if any?	<p>This question is asked to ensure that no further development will be required to connect the projects, which may also give rise to environmental impacts.</p> <p>WLDC understands that it is not the responsibility of the applicant to ensure the connection of their project to the National Grid, however it appears that there is no information on this matter within the application documents.</p>	<p>These works would mainly comprise electrical works to provide connection and protection of electrical infrastructure.</p> <p>National Grid will provide a skeleton bay at the National Grid Cottam Substation and will carry out the substation control modification work and bus bar protection required to enable the Applicant to connect.</p> <p>The Applicant will carry out all works required to take the Scheme up to the bay at the National Grid Cottam Substation. This includes work to construct the section of the Cable Route Corridor within the National Grid Cottam Substation site, works to build, equip and commission the bay at the National Grid Cottam Substation, and the installation of a system to monitor the power exported to the transmission system.</p> <p>The works required to facilitate connection undertaken by the Applicant would be under the Applicant's control and works undertaken by National Grid would be under National Grid's control.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement carried out by the Applicant has considered all of the above works within its assessment of effects. Schedule 1, Work No. 5 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] also authorises these works.</p>
Q1.2.10	NE	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain:</p> <p>The results of the assessment indicate that the current illustrative design for the Scheme is predicted to result in a net gain of 64.55% for area-based habitat units, 17.33% for hedgerow units, and 22.94% for watercourse units. How does this provision of biodiversity net gain align to the biodiversity impacts lost and specifically to those species relying on the existing biodiversity provision.</p> <p>The scheme alludes to providing over 1,000 hectares of new grassland creation. This is presumed to be principally the land area under the proposed solar panels. How will this biodiversity provision compare the biodiversity lost from the existing situation i.e. arable fields; and how will this grassland compare to grassland</p>	<p>Natural England have no comment to make on the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) provided by the Scheme as we are not a statutory consultee. Nonetheless, it is noted that impacts to individual species must be assessed in isolation from biodiversity net gain; the delivery of BNG alone should not be taken as the successful avoidance/mitigation of impacts to individual species.</p> <p>We note the mechanism for securing BNG creation is within DCO Requirement 8. It is noted that the framework LEMP does specify the commitment to a minimum of 10% BNG which is welcomed, although NE would always encourage commitment to additional gains, for example the 64.55% for area-based habitat units, 17.33% for hedgerow units, and 22.94% for watercourse units set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain report, where these are shown to be achievable.</p> <p>The mechanism for securing the ongoing maintenance of the BNG provision is included within the Framework LEMP, secured by DCO Requirement 7.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040], supported by specific surveys presented in a number of technical appendices (Appendix 9-2 to 9-11 of the ES [APP-082 to APP-093]), identifies all relevant ecological features, including individual species and provides a detailed assessment of potential impacts. The assessment presented in Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] does not conflate the assessments of specific ecological features, including individual species, with the delivery of biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The Applicant would highlight that the mechanism for securing BNG is through Requirements 7 and 8 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)]. Under Requirement 8, the BNG Strategy to be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body (being Natural England), must be substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)]. The Applicant has updated the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] at Deadline 4 to clarify that the Scheme will deliver BNG in substantial accordance with the current plans for the Scheme, as illustrated by the Indicative Landscape Masterplan [AS-064], which are predicted to result in a net gain of 64.44% for area-based habitat units, 17.28% for hedgerow units, and 22.94% for watercourse units. This is to clarify that the Applicant is committed to delivering BNG in substantial accordance with the predicted unit gains included within the BNG Report [AS-062], rather than just 10%. Requirement 7 provides that the detailed LEMP must be substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		<p>unencumbered by the overshadowing of solar panels.</p> <p>What are the mechanisms within the DCO for securing BNG creation and ensuring its ongoing maintenance as required. Ref: 7.14 BNG Report [APP-226].</p>		<p>[EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], meaning this commitment to the delivery of BNG is secured.</p>
Q1.2.2	EA	<p>The Environment Agency has requested a riparian survey of the watercourses of the cable corridor impacted by the scheme. Whilst one has been provided for the principal site, has this been undertaken on the cable route corridor and could the details of this be supplied? Ref: 6.2 Appendix 9-10 Baseline Report for Riparian Mammals [APP-091].</p>	<p>We are unclear about where we requested a riparian survey as this is not referred to in either our Relevant Representations or our Written Representations. However, we can confirm that we support a riparian survey of the watercourses of the cable corridor impacted by the scheme.</p>	<p>The Applicant understands the ExA question refers to riparian mammal surveys.</p> <p>The Applicant responded at Deadline 3 in the Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062] on the approach to riparian mammal surveys. In summary, the Applicant used a combination of field studies (undertaken by the Applicant) and existing comprehensive datasets (based on field surveys) collected by Gate Burton Energy Park, Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project, which share parts of the Cable Route Corridor with the Scheme, to determine the distribution of Water Vole within the Order limits. Much of the data used to identify potential impacts along the Cable Route Corridor is derived from these datasets. Data were obtained from the other schemes and compiled to form a comprehensive dataset for the Cable Route Corridor, which included data from field surveys. These data are presented in Appendix 9-10: Baseline Report for Riparian Mammals of the ES [APP-091]. Where the Applicant was able to obtain land access then verification surveys were undertaken to confirm conditions presented in the shared datasets.</p>
Q1.2.4	EA	<p>There is evidence of disruption to the aquatic invertebrate population by the presence of solar panels and also consequently the native bat population who rely on those invertebrates for food source and also mistake solar panels for large bodies of water. What is the likely impact on both of these populations from this scheme? Ref: BSG Ecology Report on Solar Farms impacts on wildlife.</p>	<p>We note from the BSG Ecology Report that there is a potential for solar panels to negatively affect Macroinvertebrate species, with the summary being solar farms should be kept away from important/ sensitive aquatic invertebrate populations.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we do not repeat sample in the same places enough and so cannot comment on where there might be significant populations. We would expect the applicants to look into this including getting what information there is from the local records centre and analysing it in respect of the land affected by this development.</p> <p>We appreciate the Report suggests limited impact but how specifically does the proposal stack up in relation to the comment that solar farms should be kept away from important/ sensitive aquatic invertebrate populations?</p>	<p>As set out in the Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062], Appendix 1-1: EIA Scoping Report of the ES [APP-051] scoped out the assessment of impacts on aquatic invertebrates, as <i>‘although there is limited evidence suggesting, in certain conditions, the attraction of some species of aquatic invertebrates to solar panels, there are no designated sites with aquatic invertebrate species or assemblages as qualifying features within the study area and this potential impact pathway is scoped out of further assessment. Notwithstanding this, appropriate aquatic surveys will be undertaken to assess potential impacts to watercourses.’</i> The Planning Inspectorate agreed with the scoping out of this impact in their EIA Scoping Opinion (refer to Appendix 1-2: EIA Scoping Opinion of the ES [APP-052]). Data collected as part of the baseline characterisation, including that set out in Appendix 9-2: Aquatic Ecology Baseline Report of the ES [APP-082], supported that justification for scoping out impacts to aquatic invertebrates, with no notable concentrations of aquatic invertebrates recorded.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant notes that in accordance with measures set out within Table 3-4 of the Framework CEMP [REP3-033], no works will be undertaken within at least 10m from the bank top of a watercourse. In addition, the Outline Design Principles Statement [EN0142/APP/7.4(Rev03)] sets out</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>We also see that the document suggests that gridding (and to some extent, antiglare) are effective in deterring invertebrates.</p> <p>The applicant should confirm what action has been taken in response to this.</p>	<p>that anti-reflective coating will be applied to the solar PV panels to reduce the reflective properties of the panels. These measures will limit the impact of solar panels on invertebrate populations.</p>
Q1.2.7	EA	<p>The burial depth of the cable below the river bed assesses there is only risk to migratory aquatic species in the lower water column near the bottom of the river. The Applicant advises that the migratory species can use the full depth of the water column but will they be able to sense this risk and adjust accordingly or should they have to? Ref: 6.1 Chapter 17 Other Environmental Topics [APP-048].</p>	<p>Some fish will use different depths to migrate, and some fish might detect an electromagnetic field (EMF) before adjusting their position in the water column. It is, however, also possible that some fish will detect an EMF in the water resulting in them being startled, delaying migration, or turning around (preventing migration), thus creating an invisible barrier.</p> <p>In addition, in Section.17.9.4 of the Chapter 17 document, it states ‘...where the cable route is in a trenchless crossing under the River Trent and the River Till, a minimum depth of 5m from the bed of the watercourse will be maintained. This will avoid impact on fish as a result of electro-magnetic fields.’ We consider this is hard to categorically put into writing until the monitoring is undertaken. Essentially, there could be a risk so we do not believe it can currently be said that it will avoid impact.</p>	<p>The Applicant responded to this comment fully at Deadline 3 in Table 1-1, on pages 28 and 31 of the Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>Given the cables are buried beneath the bed of the River Trent (as opposed to laid on the river bed), it would be likely that only fish occurring in the lower water column would be within a range where the low levels of EMF could be perceptible, and it is there that the risk may occur. However, regardless of this, the burial depth of a minimum of 5m below the bed of the River Trent is sufficient to avoid a significant effect on migratory fish from EMF and as such, there is negligible risk to fish occurring in any part of the water column.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the EA’s comment regarding Section.17.9.4 of Chapter 17: Other Environmental Topics of the ES [APP-048] and provides the following clarification.</p> <p>As set out within Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] and Appendix 9-12: Habitat Regulations Assessment Report of the ES [REP3-006], no likely significant effects from EMF on fish within the River Trent have been identified. Notwithstanding this, as recorded in the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency [REP3-055], the Applicant has agreed that they will contribute to the monitoring of EMF within the River Trent, as agreed with the other solar developers, with the detail to be agreed in due course. The EA accept that these discussions may take longer than it takes to determine the DCO application. The requirement for the Applicant to contribute to this programme of monitoring is set out in Table 3-4 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)].</p>
Q1.6.5	EA	<p>Can all Statutory Undertakers with Protective Provisions included within Schedule 15 of the Draft Development Consent Order advise if they are content with the provisions or challenge any parts included or missing, in particular providing detail where those items have been drawn out as outstanding and not yet subject to</p>	<p>Regrettably, the review of our standard protective provisions has taken longer than anticipated due to unforeseen circumstances. We now anticipate our review will be complete by the end of December, by which time we should be able to update the applicant and the examining authority on our position regarding the acceptability of the form of protective provisions put forward by the applicant. As we have said previously, we do not anticipate any fundamental disagreement and so do not have parts of the protective provisions to draw your attention to as an area of disagreement. We remain confident that we should be able to</p>	<p>The EA has since provided the Applicant with a copy of its updated standard protective provisions. The Applicant has reviewed the updated provisions, which are substantively agreed from the Applicant’s perspective with the exception of a few outstanding matters in respect of which the Applicant has provided comments to the EA and discussions remain ongoing.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		agreement within the relevant Statements of Common Ground?	agree the protective provision wording with the application well within the examination period.	
Q1.14.1	EA	How will the waste water arising from the cleaning of the solar panels be collected, treated and disposed of? What potential risks are associated with the wastewater and its contamination? Ref: 6.1 Chapter 10 Water Environment [APP-041].	<p>Solar farms can create increased concentration of surface water and intensify erosion in between the rows of solar panels. Flow channels could potentially occur and lead to an increased surface water peak runoff rate and runoff volume.</p> <p>Any unpermitted discharges from the site (to either surface water or groundwater) must be of clean, uncontaminated water. Discharges of any other nature may require a permit (or existing permits may require a variation).</p> <p>Water run-off and potential impact on the environment, along with mitigation measures, should be considered. Environmental impact should include the prevention of ground contamination and water course pollution should an incident occur.</p> <p>All solar farm applications should provide a drainage strategy as well as a land management strategy. Developers need to consider the vegetation on the ground below solar panels. When the ground is sufficiently vegetated and maintained, solar panels are less likely to have a significant impact on runoff rates and runoff volume.</p> <p>It is noted that the applicant proposes to discharge to surface water via swales. Any proposed swales should be designed in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS manualusing the long-term storage equation specifically addressing the additional runoff caused by a development.</p> <p>We should be grateful if the applicant’s response on how waste water arising from the panels will be collected, treated and disposed of could be considered in the context of the points we have raised.</p>	<p>As set out in the Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062], paragraph 2.2.1 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)] refers to the use of clean water with no added chemicals, sourced from local potable water suppliers, for the annual panel cleaning. As set out within Chapter 10: Water Environment of the ES [REP3-012], the Solar PV modules will be regularly observed and any panels which required maintenance / replacement will be removed. The panels are constructed in a robust manner and their components cannot be separated except with a considerable mechanical load. Therefore, the risk of any liquid leakage from the panels is very low, such that the impacts of such leaks are negligible. Any other matter washed off the panels is assumed to have already landed on the Site in a baseline scenario (i.e. dirt, dust, animal droppings), and is therefore not considered to be additional pollution added by the Scheme, nor result in measurable pollution risk. As such, this will not lead to any significant pollution risk.</p> <p>Appendix 10-4: Outline Drainage Strategy of the ES [APP-098] discusses drainage within and from the solar panel fields. Paragraph 3.1.2 of the Appendix 10-4: Outline Drainage Strategy of the ES [APP-098] notes: <i>“Despite not contributing towards the impermeable areas, in order to limit the potential for channelisation from rainfall dripping of the end of the panels, the areas between, under and surrounding the solar PV panels will be planted with native grassland and wildflower mix”</i>. The planting between panels will absorb and slow runoff from the PV fields, mimicking the existing regime. Planting will also absorb dust washed from the panels.</p> <p>Regarding the point on long term storage, edge swales within the PV fields are proposed to provide betterment to the existing runoff from the fields, reducing surface water flood risk downstream. They are not required to attenuate additional flows as there is no additional impermeable area draining to these. All new impermeable areas (i.e. BESS and Solar Stations, substations, Solar Farm Control Centre, and equipment storage) drain to separate at-source swales for attenuation, with discharge rates limited to greenfield rates; therefore, the long-term storage approach is not required.</p> <p>As summarised within Chapter 10: Water Environment of the ES [REP3-012], impacts on water quality from drainage are also assessed within Section 3.5 of Appendix 10-4: Outline Drainage Strategy of the ES [APP-098]. The assessment demonstrates that pollution is effectively managed, using the CIRIA Simple Index Approach, with appropriate treatment provided, where required. Water quality of runoff from the Scheme will not adversely impact watercourses.</p>
Q1.14.4	EA	A section of watercourse is proposed to be fenced across.	We note part of Page 2 of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) says ‘Other than solar PV Panels, no other above ground	The Applicant notes this response. The Applicant has consulted with the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lincolnshire County Council) and the Internal Drainage

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		What measures are proposed to prevent debris build up, damming and associated risk during a flood event and what are the EA/IDB/LLFA views on the crossing and obstruction of this watercourse? Ref: 6.2 Appendix 10-3 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-097].	<p>permanent built development (such as on substations or BESS) will be located within Flood Zones 2 or 3, except for a section of the 2.4m high open mesh Principal Site security fence along Field 56 in the north of the Principal Site, which will allow flood flows to pass through'. We think this must be the fence you are referring to. We see it is also referred to again on page 42 where it says 'Other than solar PV Panels, no other above ground permanent built development (such as on-substations or BESS) will be located within Flood Zones 2 or 3, except for a section of the 2.4m high open mesh Principal Site security fence along Field 56 in the north of the Principal Site, which will allow flood flows to pass through'. Finally, we note Plate 4-5: Design Flood Depth Extent on page 45 of the FRA shows where field 56 is.</p> <p>We have reviewed this and there is no main river located within or around the location this refers to. It would therefore be for the Lead Local Flood Authority/Internal Drainage Board to comment.</p>	<p>Board (Scunthorpe & Gainsborough Water Management Board) to discuss flood risk associated with the Principal Site.</p> <p>The fencing is described within Table 3-2 of the Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev03)], noting fencing is typically 2.5m high open mesh chain fencing on timber. Paragraph 4.4.8 of the Appendix 10-3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.2(Rev02)] states the fencing will not impede flood flows in and out of the floodplain. The fencing should not go across the channel bed, there will be space for the watercourse to discharge as existing and there is very little in the way of trees/debris risk that would cause an issue based on the upstream flora and fauna coverage.</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) covering the Principal Site, within their Local Impact Report [REP1A-001] paragraph 11.6, provided the following response:</p> <p><i>“With the implementation of the outlined mitigation measures, the Applicant concludes that effects on the flood risk and drainage of the area would be negligible and therefore not significant. The Council as the lead local flood authority agrees with the principles of the FRA subject to a suitably worded requirement being imposed on any Consent granted, with this in place the Council concludes that the impacts in relation to flood risk and drainage will be neutral. “</i></p>
Q1.14.7	EA	What is the vulnerability of the HDD connections and working pit locations to fluvial alignment changes in Ref: 6.2 Appendix 10-3 Flood Risk Assessment the River Trent in the future should the river meander?	<p>We assume the 'working pit locations' you refer to are the chambers that are shown either side of the river on Figure 3-12 Typical Trenchless Crossings Cross Sections (EN010142-000323-6.3) which are to be covered by manholes for future access and that HDD stands for Horizontal Directional Drilling.</p> <p>On this basis, we are not aware of channel erosion being a major issue in this area of the River Trent. There are flood defences either side of the Trent in this location which have been in place for over 50 years. We do not therefore expect erosion to affect the proposed manholes. However, the applicant's plans will involve the cable route passing through the Environment Agency (EA) flood defences which are not shown on their indicative plans. The applicant has said that they will re-consult us with their detailed plans which we will need to assess and comment on to ensure that the proposals do not adversely affect the EA defences.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. As set out within Table 3-4 of the Framework CEMP [REP3-033], launch and exit pits for the River Trent crossing will be located outside the floodplain, behind its flood defences, which are at a distance of approximately 250m to the west and 400m to the east of the watercourse edge respectively. The Applicant will request further approval on the detailed design from the EA post DCO consent, in accordance with the protective provisions included in the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)].</p>
Q1.6.5	AW	Can All Statutory Undertakers with Protective Provisions included within Schedule 15 of the Draft	<p>The Protective Provisions included in the draft DCO under Schedule 15 for the benefit of Anglian Water are now agreed between the parties. There are other aspects of Anglian</p>	<p>The agreed set of protective provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water were included in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-005].</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		Development Consent Order advise if they are content with the provisions or challenge any parts included or missing, in particular providing detail where those items have been drawn out as outstanding and not yet subject to agreement within the relevant Statements of Common Ground?	Water's position on the Scheme that remain unresolved, and these are the subject of ongoing discussions between the parties as reflected in the submitted Anglian Water SoCG (document reference Document Reference: EN010142/APP/9.15). It is the intention to provide the ExA with an update on these elements, by way of an updated SoCG, at Deadline 4.	The other aspects of this response are being addressed through the Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water [EN010142/APP/9.15] . The Applicant met with Anglian Water's representatives again on 20 January 2025 and is revising the document to reflect the latest position.
Q1.6.5	EDF	Can All Statutory Undertakers with Protective Provisions included within Schedule 15 of the Draft Development Consent Order advise if they are content with the provisions or challenge any parts included or missing, in particular providing detail where those items have been drawn out as outstanding and not yet subject to agreement within the relevant Statements of Common Ground?	<p>2.1 As noted in its written representation submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-048), EDF considers it necessary for the protection and continued safe operation and future demolition of its assets that protective provisions be included within the draft Development Consent Order ("dDCO"). The latest version of the dDCO submitted by the Promoter at Deadline 1 (REP1-008) includes a placeholder at Schedule 15, Part 15 for these protective provisions.</p> <p>2.2 Draft protective provisions have been issued to the Promoter, and the parties are in discussion regarding these with the intention that the Promoter will include these protective provisions on the face of the dDCO at a subsequent deadline.</p> <p>2.3 The Promoter and EDF are largely in agreement on the content and form of EDF's protective provisions. The only areas which remain in discussion are: 2.3.1 restrictions on the use of compulsory acquisition powers; and 2.3.2 indemnities.</p> <p>2.4 Should it not be possible to reach agreement with the Promoter on these areas, EDF reserves the right to submit its proposed protective provisions to the Examining Authority at a later deadline.</p>	The Applicant agrees with EDF's summary of the position on protective provisions. The provisions are substantively agreed, with the discussions ongoing between the Applicant and EDF regarding a limited number of outstanding matters. The Applicant is confident that agreement can be reached within the timeframe of the examination.
Q1.10.20	Canal and River Trust	Response to Applicant In relation to noise and vibration, does the Canal and River Trust have any response to the representations made by the Applicant in the document titled 'Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations' [REP1-028] (PDF Page 31)?	<p>The Trust agrees that the protective provisions secure appropriate management of construction effects, including those resulting from noise and vibration, to limit impacts on users of the river.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware that we are waiting for the next updates to the Outline Design Principles and Scheme Description documents, so they capture drilling depth specifications that fully mirror the wording used in the</p>	The Applicant submitted the updated Outline Design Principles Statement [EN010142/APP/7.4(Rev03)] and Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev03)] at Deadline 3. The wording on drilling depth under River Trent in these documents is now fully agreed with Canal and River Trust, as documented within Statement of Common Ground with Canal and River Trust [EN010142/APP/9.20(Rev02)] submitted at Deadline 4.

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			consented Gate Burton and Cottam Solar Projects and as included within the draft documents for the West Burton Solar Project.	
Q1.1.6	7000 Acres	Cumulative construction period The WLDC LIR [REP1A-005] refers to a ‘decade’ long construction period (see for example paragraph 8.14). Could WLDC please explain how it has concluded that cumulative construction could take up to a decade, with specific reference to the Applicant’s assertions to the contrary? Could the Applicant please provide a response as to whether a 10-year cumulative construction period is a realistic worse-case scenario?	<p>We have to advise that all of the applicants for the four Solar Projects; Gate Burton, Cottam, West Burton and Tillbridge, have not been very honest to date with regard to the cumulative effect on the construction period. Applying our members professional experience to the target schedules that the applicants have implied within the Cumulative Projects Report – Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions, document reference : EN010142/APP/6.1, indicates that staffing levels and transport will be significantly impacted.</p> <p>Based upon our considerable professional experience with regard to identifying and establishing realistic schedules for proposed projects worldwide we have extracted the schedule parameters provided by the four applicants and created typical solar farm schedules covering Design, Principal Site Construction, Cable Route Construction and Commissioning for each project. Using the SoS actual approval dates or the assumed approval dates that the applicants have identified, as the start dates, we have created a simple schedule for comparison of the four projects. These activities were then reviewed with regard to the applicants identified construction durations and their target connection periods. This resulted in the following schedule:-</p> <p><i>See Schedule in Document [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>Analysis of this schedule identifies that cumulative construction would commence mid 2025 and be completed by the end of 2028, ie a three year six month time period. The grid connections would occur from early 2028 until early 2029.</p> <p>What the applicants have failed to advise the ExA's is that according to the NESO Tec Register dated 26 November 2024, the earliest grid connection date is 01/08/2028 with the last project having a connection date of 31/10/2029. Applying similar durations and timing relationships to the Design, Construction and Commissioning activities, but relating the completion dates to align with the grid connection dates, results in an entirely different sequence for the projects. We have assumed that the applicants would not want a</p>	<p>The Applicant maintains that the assessment of cumulative effects during the construction period presented in Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)], including in relation to construction traffic, is robust.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the construction programmes for the cumulative schemes are indicative and that the EIA has been based on two scenarios, as described within paragraph 18.4.28 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scenario 1: All projects’ ducts and cables are installed within a construction programme of 24-36 months. It is assumed all the ducts will be installed at once and launch and reception pits and trenches will be backfilled so the area can then be re-instated. The sequence and schedule for each project is not confirmed, therefore, as a worst case, four lots of separate cable-pulling activities were assumed. The access points, haul routes and compounds would remain in place for 24-36 months to enable the cable pulls.• Scenario 2: The sequential installation of all projects’ ducts and cables over a maximum 5-year period. The access points, haul routes and compounds would remain in place for up to 5 years. <p>For cumulative traffic effects, Scenario 1 is a worst-case scenario as it assumes that each project’s construction activities occurs at the same time, with no discount for efficiencies. This includes the laying of cable routes, and the peak level of construction vehicles (staff and deliveries) for each project. As set out in 18.17.9, this assumes no consolidation of trips as a result of co-ordinating the construction of these schemes. It also assumes that each construction peak would occur simultaneously, which is relatively unlikely as the projects are at different stages. Thus, the highest possible level of traffic, and therefore magnitude of effect, has been assessed within Sections 18.15 and 18.17 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)].</p> <p>It is also important to note that the assessment has utilised the forecast traffic flows on each link where the study area overlaps, meaning that it is an accurate assessment of the combined impacts of each of the schemes based on the access arrangements which will be secured through each DCO.</p> <p>The cumulative environmental effects are not likely to be materially different, if the start dates of the projects were changed, and the magnitude of the impacts would be less, if the peaks did not overlap.</p> <p>Cumulative assessment of impacts on visitor accommodation presented within Section 18.15 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>completed project to sit unused for any length of time, so have delayed the start of design until later for some projects</p> <p><i>See Schedule in Document [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>Analysis of this schedule identifies that cumulative construction would commence early 2026 and be completed by the mid 2029, ie a three year five month time period. The grid connections would occur from August 2028 until October 2029.</p> <p>The impact of these delayed starts to construction, even though the overall construction periods are very similar, becomes more obvious when you consider the construction staffing and traffic movements.</p> <p>In order to identify the construction staffing patterns the average and peak manpower details for the principal site and the cable route, for each of the four projects, was extracted from the Cumulative Projects Report – Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions, document reference: EN010142/APP/6.1. These numbers were then allocated against each of the scheduled activities using standard S curve applications associated with construction work. This has resulted in the following histograms:-</p> <p><i>See histogram in Doc [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>This histogram based upon the applicants target schedules depicts an average construction staff of 1366 people for 42 months, with a peak value of 3000.</p> <p><i>See histogram in Doc [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>This histogram based upon the grid connection date schedules depicts an average construction staff of 1400 people for 41 months, with a peak value of 2700.</p> <p>In addition to these construction staff numbers the number of people associated with Site Management, catering, welfare, security, warehouse management, commissioning etc. need to also be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>[EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] has been validated by the information provided within Appendix C of Applicant’s Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP3-061]. The appendix does not change the conclusions presented within Section 18.15 and confirms that the effect of the cumulative peak construction workforce on the accommodation sector is not likely to be significant, considering the capacity of accommodation within the study area.</p> <p>The worst-case cumulative traffic impact has been assessed in accordance with the IEMA criteria (Ref 1-14) within Section 18.17 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)]. In accordance with the assessment criteria above, the cumulative traffic effects are not likely to be significant.</p> <p>The need for the Scheme is supported by national planning policy and other national energy and environmental policy, and the Scheme addresses relevant national and local planning policies through its design, avoiding sensitive areas and limiting adverse impacts where practicable. In terms of the overall planning balance, the clear and substantial benefits of the Scheme in providing large amounts of renewable energy in a time of climate emergency clearly outweigh any adverse effects, which would be localised, short-term, temporary and/or reversible at the end of the Scheme’s lifetime. The presumption in favour of consent in NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) sets out that these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of critical national priority infrastructure.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>It has been assumed by each of the applicants that all of these construction staff numbers would be available from an area within 45km of the sites and that non-local workers would stay at local accommodation and be transported to the sites via shuttle bus to minimise the impact on the surrounding highway network. It is highly unlikely that this level of suitable local accommodation is available within this agricultural area.</p> <p>Another factor that this level of construction staff creates is the impact on local transport. By using the values that the applicants have included within the Cumulative Projects Report – Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions, document reference : EN010142/APP/6.1, and applying these values to the two schedules, using our professional experience associated with construction programs, we have derived traffic movement histograms for construction staff travelling by car and by coaches. This results in the following daily movement histograms:-</p> <p><i>See histogram in Doc [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>This histogram based upon the applicants target schedules depicts an average daily construction staff movement of 1322 for 42 months, with a peak value of 2864. This identifies as an average of 661 cars and coaches travelling to the sites each morning and 661 on the local roads each evening for the construction staff to return home, with peak values of 1432 each morning and 1432 each evening.</p> <p>This increased level of cars and coaches travelling on the local roads each morning and each evening, for three and a half years, will definitely impact on the local residents’ enjoyment of the lightly used local road network. It might also have an impact on the number of accidents occurring on the local roads and ultimately the insurance costs associated with vehicle ownership. This factor has been totally ignored by each of the applicants in their evaluation of cumulative impacts. The equivalent histogram for the grid connection date schedule results in:-</p> <p><i>See histogram in Doc [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>This histogram based upon the grid connection date schedule depicts an average daily construction staff</p>	

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>movement of 1354 for 41 months, with a peak value of 2666. This identifies as an average of 677 cars and coaches travelling to the sites each morning and 677 on the local roads each evening for the construction staff to return home, with peak values of 1333 each morning and 1333 each evening.</p> <p>It is not just staff that will be travelling on the local roads. During each and every day there will be HGV and LGV vehicles moving goods to each location. The cumulative assessments contained within the Cumulative Projects Report – Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions, document reference : EN010142/APP/6.1, tend to concentrate on individual roads and as such play down the overall impact on all of our local roads of the magnitude of these lorries and vans on our daily lives.</p> <p><i>See histogram in Doc [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>This histogram has been derived by assigning the applicants quantity data of HGV and LGV vehicle movements to the scheduled construction activities. When evaluated against their target schedule it produces overall daily averages of 747 vehicle movements each day with a peak value of 1800. Therefore each weekday for 42 months we will have to encounter an additional 747 lorries and vans on our local roads. It will make each and every journey that much longer and with much more probability of delays or accidents. At each access point to the four projects we will be delayed by vehicles turning into and out of them, controlled by banksmen or temporary traffic lights.</p> <p>The equivalent histogram for the grid connection date schedule results in:-</p> <p><i>See histogram in Doc [REP3-092].</i></p> <p>When evaluated against the grid connection schedule it produces overall daily averages of 765 vehicle movements each day for 41 months, with a peak value of 1880.</p> <p>In conclusion the applicants have all failed to provide simple scheduling, construction staffing and vehicle movement data</p>	

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>that the local population can understand so as to relate to the significant impact on their daily lives that these four solar projects will have upon them.</p> <p>Therefore this application for Tillbridge Solar Project should be rejected, as it will have too much of an impact on the local residents daily lives with very little benefit to the availability of renewable energy at times that the population need it.</p>	
Q1.1.18	7000 Acres	Paragraph 5.2.1 at Appendix B of the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [REP1-046] outlines that the Proposed Development would be overplanted at a ratio of 1.57 (157%). Could the Applicant please provide evidence to demonstrate what ratios typically apply to other schemes (either consented or in the process of being consented – for example Gate Burton, West Burton and Cottam) and justify any difference in the ratio of overplanting proposed? Please note footnote 92 of NPS EN-3 requires a justification to be provided for overplanting.	<p>In 7000 Acres WR REP2-027, Section 8.3, we highlighted that overplanting, as referred to in NPS-EN3 is foreseen only in terms of how “installed generating capacity of a solar farm will decline over time in correlation with the reduction in panel array efficiency”. The Applicant has clearly set out the economic objective of maximising utilisation of grid capacity, rather than to address foreseeable panel degradation.</p> <p>With regard to the ratio of 1.3 to 1.5% overplanting, this simply represents an economic trade-off between the additional costs of deployment and land, versus the marginal benefit of being able to make greater use of the grid connection. This is the economic case made in the Applicant's Statement of Need, and therefore does not relate to the decline in panel efficiency over time.</p> <p>If the developers had confidence in their claims of future improvements in technology, by the time the solar panels are life-expired and require exchanging, these could be replaced with panels that take less land, however, their assumption is to overplant from day 1, and therefore occupy up to 50% more land than necessary, showing their lack of commitment to minimising or mitigating the impacts of their development.</p> <p>In practice, it should be noted that, by overplanting, the yield would therefore be reduced – from an already meagre 10%-11% in the UK, which results from being in an area of such low solar gain. This means that the energy production and therefore decarbonisation potential of panels in an overplanted scheme in the UK would be some of the lowest worldwide – which should be thoroughly explored in terms of what this means for the genuine carbon reduction potential of the panels, or indeed the efficient, sustainable use of global resources.</p>	<p>The Applicant has previously confirmed that panel degradation has been factored into the overplanting ratio. This approach has been detailed in the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [REP1-046], where it was explained how overplanting maximises the utilisation of the grid capacity, ensuring that the grid connection is used as efficiently as possible throughout the Scheme's operational life.</p> <p>Overplanting allows the Scheme to ensure that the generating capacity remains aligned with the grid connection's potential whilst at the same time compensating for the gradual decline in panel efficiency over time, so called degradation. Without overplanting, the Scheme would underutilise the grid connection, effectively wasting the capacity of both the connection and the associated land use. This would result in less efficient land use compared to a project that incorporates overplanting to optimise its performance. By adopting this strategy, the Scheme ensures that its environmental footprint per unit of energy generated is minimised.</p> <p>It is important to note that overplanting is not simply a necessary measure to maximise the utility of the grid connection, which represents a significant infrastructure investment, but is intrinsically a response to panel degradation. By installing additional capacity from the outset, the Scheme can take full advantage of periods of higher solar irradiation while still maintaining grid connection efficiency as panel performance diminishes over time.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that advancements in solar technology may result in more efficient panels in the future. However, planning for overplanting from the beginning is a prudent approach, as during the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme the worst case must be understood and not the best case. This ensures the success of the Scheme to contribute effectively to meeting the UK's net-zero targets while making optimal use of the available land and grid infrastructure.</p> <p>The claim that overplanting reduces the yield is incorrect. Overplanting does not reduce the total energy output of the Scheme; rather, it allows for maximized use of the grid connection capacity by increasing energy production during peak irradiation periods. While overplanting may have an indirect effect on the specific yield of individual panels (i.e., energy produced per unit area), these</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				effects can be mitigated through careful design choices such as optimal row spacing, panel orientation, and the use of technologies like DC coupling. In fact, by combining overplanting with efficient design, the overall yield of the Scheme is increased, enhancing its decarbonisation potential and ensuring the efficient, sustainable use of resources.
Q1.1.22	7000 Acres	<p>Paragraph 8.3.9 at Appendix B of the Written Summary of the Applicant’s Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [REP1-046] outlines in part:</p> <p>“Using the current indicative Scheme design, it is estimated that the BESS will be charged by the solar PV array on approximately 30% of the days in a year.”</p> <p>If that is the case, then what function is the BESS fulfilling for the majority of the year (70%)?</p>	<p>The most significant challenge to making the deployment of large solar capacity a success is the potential to be able to store energy from the summer, to avoid curtailment, for use in the winter. The proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) cannot deliver this.</p> <p>Due to the lack of information provided it is difficult to assess the planned capacity of the BESS. However, reading across from similar systems in the area, a 500MW BESS would only be capable of storing 1 hour of peak generations in summer (circa 500MW for the main scheme plus 50% overplanting). Therefore it will make a minimal contribution to offsetting solar generation from when it is not required on a warm summer day to peak demand in the evening. However, it will make a significant contribution to the profitability of the scheme by permitting energy arbitrage at night and in the winter months when it will store energy from other sources, including those generated by fossil fuels. If the BESS is not supporting the solar scheme for 70% of the year, the income from the BESS is clearly additional revenue.</p> <p>As the Consent will be for operating a “generating station”, revenue operations when the scheme is not capable of generating power should be viewed as a separate system. The PA (2008) Associated Development Guidance states in paragraph 5 (iii) that:</p> <p>“Developments should not be treated as associated development if it is only necessary as a source of additional revenue for the applicant, in order to cross subsidise the cost of the principal development”.</p>	<p>While it is acknowledged that storing energy from summer to winter is a significant challenge, it is not the sole challenge facing the deployment of renewable energy at scale. To meet national renewable energy targets, the grid must integrate increasing levels of intermittent generation. Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) are therefore essential for providing short-term balancing services, ensuring stability and reliability in the grid.</p> <p>As detailed in Paragraph 8.3.8 at Appendix B of the Written Summary of the Applicant’s Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [REP1-046], the proposed BESS is designed to store four hours of generation capacity, not one hour. During summer peaks, when solar energy may not align with immediate grid demand, the BESS can store excess energy generated by the solar PV for discharge during evening hours when solar generation ceases, directly addressing periods of peak demand. This purpose can be fulfilled even when the generated energy otherwise would be curtailed in the system. This function ensures the BESS makes a substantial contribution to the Scheme's objectives, contrary to claims of minimal impact.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) establishes the benefits and need for electricity storage. The role of energy storage as providing flexibility and increased reliability of the electricity system is recognised in EN-1 3.3.25, and at 3.3.26 - 27 EN-1 sets out further benefits in terms of storing surplus electricity in times of low demand to provide electricity when demand is higher, and maximising the usable output from intermittent low carbon generation, including solar and providing grid balancing services. Storage is described in 3.3.25 as having a "key role" to play in achieving net zero and providing flexibility to the energy system. Paragraphs 3.3.4 – 3.3.6 also set out the need for different types of electricity infrastructure that are needed to deliver the Government’s energy objectives, and electricity storage as listed alongside other infrastructure as having a role:</p> <p><i>3.3.5 New generating plants can deliver a low carbon and reliable system, but we need the increased flexibility provided by new storage and interconnectors (as well as demand side response, discussed below) to reduce costs in support of an affordable supply.</i></p> <p><i>3.3.6 Storage and interconnection can provide flexibility, meaning that less of the output of plant is wasted as it can either be stored or exported when there is excess production. They can also supply electricity when domestic demand is higher than generation, supporting security of supply. This means that the total amount of generating plant capacity required to meet peak demand is reduced, bringing significant system savings alongside demand side response (up to £12bn per year by 2050).</i>⁴⁰ Storage can also reduce the need for new</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p><i>network infrastructure. However, neither of these technologies, as with demand side response, are sufficient to meet the anticipated increase in total demand, and so cannot fully replace the need for new generating capacity.</i></p> <p>To the extent interested parties are seeking to challenge the benefits of or need for short term storage, such submissions go to the merits of the NPS itself and this Application is not the forum for such arguments, as confirmed by the Planning Act 2008 (Ref 1-12) which specifically provides that such submissions may be disregarded.</p> <p>The associated development tests, as outlined in Subchapter 8.3 at Appendix B of the Written Summary of the Applicant’s Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [REP1-046], are fully adhered to. The BESS is not intended “only” as a source of additional revenue or cross-subsidisation for the principal development. The Applicant has been very clear that the primary purpose of the BESS is to take energy from the solar PV in order to support the solar generating station. Its secondary purpose is to provide ancillary and grid balancing services, which also supports the Scheme and other intermittent renewable generation like the scheme but offering additional flexibility and balancing which is needed to address the impact of increasing amounts of renewable energy. The role of the BESS in storing and discharging energy from other sources, further enhances grid stability and supports the broader decarbonisation goals of the energy system, as supported by the policy goals outlined within the Overarching Energy NPS (Ref 1-1) and other government climate change policies.</p> <p>Paragraph 5(iii) of the Associated Development Guidance (Ref 1-15) includes a core principle that development will not be associated development if it is <i>only</i> necessary as a source of additional revenue for the Applicant. It does not place a prohibition on associated development generating any revenue at all. The BESS proposed for this Scheme is not proposed as a stand alone element with the sole purpose of cross-subsidising the cost of the Solar PV, and instead has been carefully designed to co-locate with and align with the generating capacity of the Solar PV proposed. The Applicant’s submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 3 expand on this point further.</p> <p>In conclusion, the BESS is a critical component of the Scheme, serving both the generating station and the wider energy system in a manner consistent with national renewable energy objectives and planning policy requirements.</p>
Q1.1.24	7000 Acres	Section 4.3 of the Written Summary of the Applicant’s Oral Submissions at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [REP1-046] states in part:	Although the “wholesale replacement of all the schemes component is not authorised”, piecemeal replacement of all components will be permitted on a rolling basis due to the lax wording of this requirement. As the Applicant’s greenhouse gas emission calculations is based on only one replacement	The Applicant does not consider it appropriate nor necessary for additional controls to be included within the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] or requirements as to the number of replacements that can be provided for any one component of the Scheme.

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		"Wholesale replacement of all Scheme components is not authorised under Article 5(1), with assumptions around HGV traffic in the Framework OEMP and Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047] reflecting this approach."	cycle of the solar panels, and 10 years replacement of BESS batteries, this should be made an explicit limit in the dDCO.	<p>As outlined in paragraph 7.3.24 of Chapter 7: Climate Change of the ES [APP-038], the degradation rate of Scheme components like PV panels is assumed based on applications for similar solar installations. These rates are conservative and exceed that declared in the Environmental Product Declaration (EPD) of the components. Some components may therefore not require replacement at the rates assumed in the greenhouse gas assessment. However, where individual components are damaged or malfunction, these may need to be replaced at a higher rate than what is assumed on an overall basis by that greenhouse gas assessment. This is considered to "average out" on an overall basis, such that the greenhouse gas assessment is met without applying a strict restriction on replacement. Applying such a restriction would lead to unintended outcomes where broken or malfunctioning components could not be replaced on an individual basis, where they had been replaced once before, despite environmental effects otherwise being managed appropriately. This would undermine the undertaker's ability to appropriately operate and maintain its own site, and meet the full benefits of renewable energy generation provided by the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to consider the replacement of various solar infrastructure components during the operational phase of the Scheme are appropriately managed by Section 2.3 of the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)]. In addition, the approach to the drafting of "maintain" and Article 5 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] is entirely consistent with the approach in made Energy DCOs including the Longfield Solar Farm Order 2023, the Gate Burton Energy Park Order 2024, the Cottam Solar Project Order 2024, and the Sunnica Energy Farm Order 2024, and similar drafting also appears in the Mallard Pass Solar Farm Order 2024.</p>
Q1.1.28	7000 Acres	Many representations from Interested Parties have challenged the 'need' for the Proposed Development and refer to other technologies or roof-mounted solar development. Notwithstanding the information contained in the Applicant's existing application documents, could it please succinctly set out a response with specific reference to the key policy and legislative differences between the current project and the Cottam, West Burton and Gate Burton NSIPs?	<p>While the overall policy and legislative landscape for the Tillbridge scheme is broadly similar to that for the Cottam, West Burton and Gate Burton NSIP schemes, it is clear that more information is now known about the volume of solar development required.</p> <p>Since the Government's ambition for 70GW of solar was launched in 2022, there have been several calls to ensure a planned deployment of solar as part of a land use strategy, e.g. from Skidmore, and the Government has accepted calls for a Strategic Spatial Energy Plan, e.g. from the Electricity Network Commissioner's Report (2023).</p> <p>The newly formed National Energy System Operator (NESO) was commissioned in October 2024 to produce the SSEP. In addition, it was asked by the DESNZ to provide advice on how best to meet the new Government's ambition to bring forward the target of decarbonising electricity generation to 2030 from 2035. Their Clean Power 2030 report (November</p>	<p>These comments from 7000 Acres repeat comments made in their Deadline 2 Submissions to which the Applicant has provided responses to in Table 2-2 (pages 13-19) of the Applicant's Response to Written Submissions at Deadline 2 [REP3-063].</p> <p>The Applicant would also reiterate the general point made elsewhere and re-emphasised at the recent issue specific hearings (and which was recognised by the Examining Authority in particular in its comments at the Open Floor Hearing) that the need for NSIP scale solar (being infrastructure covered by the suite of Energy NPSs) is not up for debate. NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) is very clear at paragraphs 3.2.6 to 3.2.8 (and these paragraphs are in bold for emphasis) that the Secretary of State should assess all applications for development consent for the types of infrastructure included by the NPS (including solar) on the basis that there is demonstrated urgent need for them, that substantial weight should be given to this need, and that the Secretary of State is not required to consider the specific contribution of any individual project to be satisfied that need is established.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>2024) provides important context for the implementation of solar.</p> <p>Figure 14 of the NESO CP 2030 report provides a high-level spatial capacity map of technology needed for different pathways, including solar. Following the many calls for a planned consideration of how much and where solar technology should be deployed, and this is the first time this has been done. The report provides a broad regional breakdown of solar installation across the country. Supporting data for the maps within Table ES5 show around 7.6GW of solar installed for the “East of England” region, and although there isn’t a direct read-across between NESO’s regions and the NSIP applications database, it is notable that there are already 22 solar schemes on the NSIP database for nearest equivalent area (Eastern and East Midlands), with an estimated capacity of c. 11GW. In addition, within the Renewable Energy Planning Database there are 150 further non-NSIP scale ground-mounted solar schemes within the counties of the same region, either within planning or pending construction. This illustrates the situation of uncontrolled and excess development within the region, which is way over that anticipated by NESO to achieve the Clean Power 2030 objective.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the schemes and capacity above do not include any rooftop solar capacity, despite the Government’s ambition for a “rooftop revolution” for solar installation. All this explains the urgency of developers to get schemes consented, before adequate controls are applied.</p> <p>The CP2030 report also highlights that, in addition to current solar installation (c. 16GW), there is already a pipeline of 70GW of solar by 2030, plus a further 47GW by 2035. Again, much of this pipeline represents transmission or distribution connected solar capacity – which will be at least substantially, if not entirely ground mounted.</p> <p>The current uncontrolled scramble for ground mounted solar simply risks allowing schemes to be placed on a first-come-first-served basis, rather than properly considering how and where solar should be deployed – including the capacity required for rooftop solar – which, under the current appetite for developers to pursue ground mounted schemes, will be next to zero. 7000 Acres have already highlighted the example of Germany, which has already achieved more than</p>	<p>In spite of this the Applicant has engaged with the types of comments made by 7000 Acres and has responded at length elsewhere in the documents submitted to the Examination. However, such arguments go to the merits of the National Policy Statements and sections 87(3), 94(8) and 106(1) of the Planning Act 2008 (Ref 1-12) make clear that such submissions may be disregarded.</p> <p>Submissions such as those put forward by 7000 Acres go to the heart of the whole Planning Act 2008 regime, a key purpose of which was to tackle the lack of clear statements of national policy particularly on the national need for infrastructure. The objective was for policies on matters such as need to be formulated and tested through the process leading up to the decision to adopt a NPS. Change to the policy is not achieved via the determination of individual applications. The Planning Act 2008 provides a specific process for challenge to the NPS itself as well as for its revision and update, and this Application is not the appropriate means by which to achieve that.</p> <p>In response to comments that Germany has achieved more than the UK’s ambition of 70GW of solar, with over 70% on rooftops, the Applicant can confirm that Germany is not solely prioritising residential rooftop solar installations. While residential systems play a significant role in the energy transition, large-scale projects remain essential to meet the country’s ambitious energy targets. For example, the Witznitz Energy Park, operational since July 2024, became Germany’s largest solar project with a capacity of 650 MWp.</p> <p>Relying exclusively on rooftop solar installations would fall short of meeting overall energy demands, potentially resulting in grid instability and supply challenges. Energy experts have highlighted that the increasing integration of solar PV in residential or commercial areas, could lead to localised grid congestion and reliability concerns without appropriate grid upgrades and large-scale energy balancing solutions. This illustrates and confirms that the situation in Germany is no different to the UK with Germany also having an urgent need to deploy both ground mounted and rooftop solar.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
			<p>the UK’s ambition of 70GW of solar, with over 70% on rooftops – and without a single scheme even half the size of the proposed Tillbridge scheme. The need case presented by the Applicant is overstated to suit their purpose.</p> <p>In addition, the Land Use Framework promised by the Government remains overdue, but it is clear that solar schemes have the potential to occupy a significant amount of land, which must be properly considered before extensive solar development is consented without fully understanding the implications. Already the pipeline of Transmission and Distribution connected solar schemes visible to National Grid are in excess of 150GW, which would imply an area twice the size of Greater Manchester. Even if all this is not constructed, it constitutes a massive burden on planning processes, consultancy resources and the communities affected</p>	
Q1.2.8	7000 Acres	What is Natural England's view on the likely impact on the scheme and whether it results in a net displacement of bird population or encourages ground nesting due to lack of predators? Ref: 6.2 Appendix 9-8 Baseline Report for Non-Breeding Birds [APP-089]	Birds of prey are a vital predator within the local ecosystem and have been present in the landscape over many, many generations. Their important historical presence and value are illustrated in that the name Glentworth derives from the Old English glente + worth for ‘enclosure frequented by birds of prey’. Potential impacts on this specific predator will not only affect the ecosystems and biodiversity it will also impact the historical fabric of the area as the land, wildlife and communities have a symbiotic relationship symbolised in the origins of the name of Glentworth.	<p>Impacts on breeding and non-breeding birds are assessed in Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040].</p> <p>Over 200ha of undeveloped land in open ‘Biodiversity Zones’, along with over 1,000 ha of grassland creation, has been incorporated into the Scheme design, as set out within the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)]. This habitat creation will benefit a wide range of bird species, ensuring no net displacement of bird populations. In areas where the target is to provide suitable habitat for ground-nesting bird species, such as Skylark and Curlew, the perimeter security will not include passages for mammals, as is proposed elsewhere throughout the Scheme. This will aid in reducing nest predation from ground predators.</p> <p>To clarify, there will be no adverse effect on birds of prey. In fact, with the creation of extensive areas of permanent grassland, hedgerow and tree planting and sensitive management of habitats for biodiversity, there will be an increase in the abundance of both bird and small mammal/rodent prey for birds of prey present within the Scheme.</p>
Q1.2.9	7000 Acres	Is there any evidence to establish the impact on commuting and foraging bats of the presence of large areas of solar panels? Ref: 6.2 Appendix 9-9 Baseline Report for Bats [APP-090].	<p>Research is showing that ground mounted solar has a significant adverse impact on protected bat species. For example, research paper:</p> <p>“Renewable energies and biodiversity: Impact of ground-mounted solar photovoltaic sites on bat activity. Elizabeth Tinsley, Jérémy S. P. Froidevaux, Sándor Zsebők, Kriszta Lilla Szabadi, Gareth Jones. published August 2023.”</p>	The potential for operational impacts on bats is discussed in Section 9.9, specifically paragraphs 9.9.38 to 9.9.42, of Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] . This describes how there is limited scientific literature available on the impacts to bats from solar farms, with comparable sized schemes not yet operational. It also sets out how recent studies from small scale solar schemes, including the study referenced by 7,000 Acres, did not have any significant new tree/hedge planting, and/or grassland creation and so are unlikely to be comparable to this Scheme (and other large-scale DCO schemes) where significant areas of habitat creation and enhancement are provided. The Applicant has concluded that, taking into account embedded mitigation measures and a Scheme design which sets back PV panel arrays from all important habitats used by commuting and foraging

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				bats, i.e., hedgerows and woodlands, there is no robust data to suggest that, with the embedded mitigation measures set out in Section 9.8 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] , significant displacement of bats from these habitats will occur.
Q1.2.10	7000 Acres	<p>The results of the assessment indicate that the current illustrative design for the Scheme is predicted to result in a net gain of 64.55% for area-based habitat units, 17.33% for hedgerow units, and 22.94% for watercourse units. How does this provision of biodiversity net gain align to the biodiversity impacts lost and specifically to those species relying on the existing biodiversity provision. The scheme alludes to providing over 1,000 hectares of new grassland creation. This is presumed to be principally the land area under the proposed solar panels. How will this biodiversity provision compare the biodiversity lost from the existing situation i.e. arable fields; and how will this grassland compare to grassland unencumbered by the overshadowing of solar panels.</p> <p>What are the mechanisms within the DCO for securing BNG creation and ensuring its ongoing maintenance as required. Ref: 7.14 BNG Report [APP-226]</p>	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain is a very new addition to planning requirements in the UK, having been due to apply in November 2023, it is now due to come into force from January 2024, and apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects in 2025.</p> <p>There is very little experience or track record of its use as a methodology, and while a number of case studies have been published, e.g. by Natural England, these are hypothetical illustrations of the methodology, and cover relatively small areas of development (<10ha.) in comparison to large scale solar development (e.g. solar developments at over 1200Ha.)</p> <p>The baseline fails to recognise the pressure that farming is under to change over this time period, either in terms of decarbonisation or biodiversity – and therefore to assume the baseline would have remained unchanged for the duration of the project is flawed.</p>	<p>The Applicant responded in detail at Deadline 3 within Applicant's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>The creation and enhancement of habitats which have generated the predicted unit gains presented in the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [AS-062], have been informed by the detailed ecological surveys presented in Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] which have identified the existing biodiversity present, and with reference and regard to the relevant national and local biodiversity policies as described in Section 1.4 of BNG Report [AS-062]. As such, the provision for biodiversity net gain closely aligns with the baseline biodiversity conditions present within the Order limits and national and local biodiversity priorities.</p> <p>Details of these measures are set out in the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], along with details of their management and monitoring. None of the proposed habitat creations and enhancements rely on untested or unproven solutions. In fact, there is now a growing body of evidence from operational solar farms (for example that published extensively by Solar Energy UK and readily available online) that enhancements, such as the ones described in the Framework LEMP, deliver a wide range of benefits for biodiversity.</p> <p>In line with the relevant guidance set out for the Statutory Metric, the baseline is calculated on the current extent and condition of habitats present.</p>
Q1.7.5	7000 Acres	<p>ES Paragraph 8.9.444 [APP-039] states in full: "<i>Construction of the Scheme within the Principal Site would result in the long-term change of land-use from intensive agriculture to solar park renewable energy generation. Despite this, the Scheme preserves the pattern, layout and key boundaries and features of the historic landscape, enabling the grain of the two historic landscape character zones</i></p>	<p>By proposing to cover the existing Historic Landscape in solar panels along with associated equipment whilst utilising the existing field pattern does not mean that the two treatments can be read together within this landscape. The use is profoundly different and in stark contrast to the existing and therefore means that the landscape cannot be read as one as it is now.</p> <p>Also, the Applicant states that 'coherence, time depth and legibility' will be retained. 7000 acres disagrees with this statement. The landscape will be under the proposed</p>	<p>The Applicant provided further detail on its assessment of impacts on historic landscape character at Deadline 3 within its response to Q1.7.5 (in addition to others), as set out in the Applicant's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>Further to the above, the Applicant wishes to re-state that vegetation removal within the Principal Site is very limited. As stipulated in Section 6 of the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], the Scheme will not result in the loss of valued or historic landscape features such as veteran or ancient trees and there will be only localised removal of short sections of hedgerow and a small number of low-value trees, where this cannot be avoided for access, as secured by the Framework CEMP [REP3-033]. The Applicant does not</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		<p><i>to retain their coherence, time depth and legibility. This is assessed as a low magnitude of impact on historic landscape character zones of medium value, resulting in a long term minor adverse magnitude of impact, which is not significant.”</i></p> <p>Could the Applicant please expand or provide further evidence for this conclusion? In reaching this conclusion what comparative value has been assigned to the contribution of the existing fields within the principal site (and their associated agricultural use) towards the historic landscape character and how will the Proposed Development affect this? In addition, what effect would proposed landscaping (screening) measures have on the historic landscape?</p>	<p>development. Visibility and understanding of the land and landscape is removed from view by the scheme.</p> <p>The views from the ‘Lincoln Cliff’ are wide and long across the Historic Landscape. The atmosphere is majestic and timeless. By removing existing established hedgerows and trees and planting hedgerows and trees to ‘screen’ the proposed scheme, the Applicant is removing planting that adds to the view and is replacing it with planting that blocks the view. These proposals fundamentally harm the historic landscape.</p>	<p>consider that these losses will be perceptible from locations along the Cliff; and that new planting, once mature, will more than compensate for their removal.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant acknowledges that some views from the Cliff will be screened by the proposed planting, this would be for a maximum of 1km along Middle Street which is not considered to be attractive to recreational users such as walkers and cyclists; and along which no public parking is available. This is compared to an overall length of approximately 25km, from Lincoln to Kirton in West Lindsey, from where views from Middle Street may be available. Furthermore, the published description for Regional Character Area 2 The Northern Cliff in the LHLC (Ref 1-16) notes that “<i>creation of plantation woodland and game covert</i>” was one element that followed nineteenth century enclosure, alongside the planting of hedged field boundaries.</p>
Q1.9.4	7000 Acres	<p>ES Paragraph 12.4.13 [APP-043] states in full: “<i>It should be noted that the ZTVs for the solar PV panels do not demonstrate the theoretical visibility of such features across the entire Principal Site. Due to computer processing capabilities, reference points were taken from the outer boundary of the Panel areas. As such, some areas of panels, particularly along slightly higher topography such as the north-south ridge between the A631 and Harpswell Wood, may increase theoretical visibility beyond that shown.</i>” On that basis are the ZTVs accurate? Could the Applicant model the Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) on the basis of the boundaries and the higher topography within the Order Limits?</p>	<p>Without accurate and representative modelling, findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are brought into question along with any subsequent measures.</p> <p>7000 acres argues that it is not acceptable for the Applicant to guess.</p>	<p>Subsequent to the response to this question at Deadline 3 within Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062], the Applicant can confirm that the ZTVs for the solar panels were generated from points at 250m intervals around the boundary to the individual panel areas, i.e. at the field level. Paragraph 12.4.13 of Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rcv02)] has therefore been updated and submitted at Deadline 4 to confirm that the ZTVs for the solar panels take into account topographic variations within the Principal Site, including low points along the southern boundary; in addition to locations around ‘cut-out’ features such as Harpswell Wood. The ZTV is therefore considered to be a robust basis for the LVIA, although the Applicant re-states that the effect of screening by hedgerows and individual trees is not taken into account.</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
Q1.9.11	7000 Acres	ES Paragraph 12.6.17 [APP-043] states: “At the time of ES preparation, an application to claim a new bridleway has been submitted to LCC, reinstating a section of the historic ‘low’ route along the base of the Cliff between Harpswell and Glentworth, parallel to Middle Street.” Can LCC and the Applicant please provide an update?	Both Glentworth Parish Council and Harpswell Parish Council have spent many years seeking the reinstatement of this historic route for the enjoyment and health and wellbeing of their communities. It affords an important physical link between the villages for people in the area and further afield. This is a route which communities wish to use within the historic landscape and enjoy the long views across the Till Vale once again.	<p>The Applicant confirms that the claimed Glentworth and Harpswell Public Bridleway route, which the two DMMO applications relate to, has been assessed as a definitive route within the ES, specifically within Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity [REP3-014], Chapter 14: Socioeconomics and Land Use [APP-045] and Chapter 16: Transport and Access [APP-047] of the ES. It is also included within the Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP3-041], Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] and Schedule 6, Part 4 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] as set out below.</p> <p>The Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] provides a framework for achieving the outline design, as presented in Figure 3-1: Indicative Principal Site Layout Plan of the ES [AS-055]. Paragraph 1.2.11 of the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)] acknowledges the presence of the claimed route confirming that works are only proposed for mitigation and enhancement in this area. The Scheme design has considered the claimed route as though it has been confirmed to ensure that should it be confirmed that both the Scheme and claimed PRoW can coexist. The land subject to the DMMO is not proposed for development comprising mitigation and enhancement land for biodiversity and archaeology. Further controls are also built into the Scheme through the Works Plans [REP2-004] which only authorise Work No. 9 (habitat management and protection) and 11 (sensitive archaeological site) in this area. These works relate to the provision of green infrastructure and comprise no development areas. The detailed design will need to be substantially in accordance with the development authorised by the Works Plans [REP2-004] across the Principal Site which fix the area and location of the Biodiversity Zones and the Sensitive Archaeological Sites. In addition, should the claimed route be confirmed, the Framework Public Right of Way Management Plan [REP3-041] includes measures to manage the claimed route during construction (temporary stopping up and diversion) should this be required (paragraph 3.1.15). The temporary management of the claimed PRoW should it be confirmed is further secured and shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-005] (PRoW – 4/01 and 4/02 of sheet 4 of 24). Finally, article 12 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] also includes provisions for the temporary management of claimed PRoWs to allow the authorised development to proceed and article 11, Schedule 6, Part 4 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] authorises the management of PRoW 4/01 and 4/02 (the claimed “Low Road”) during construction.</p> <p>As such, if the DMMO applications are approved, this would not change the conclusions of the ES.</p>
Q1.9.18	7000 Acres	LCC LIR paragraph 5.14 [REP1A-001] states in part: “This reduced to three receptors or viewpoints experiencing significant residual effects at year 15 which suggests a	The reduction in significant effects from eleven at Year 1 to three and Year 15 is attributed by the Applicant to the planting of hedgerows and trees and these becoming established during this timeframe. The question arises when, if the planting fails and does not become established or does	The Applicant responded to this question in detail at Deadline 3 within Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062] .

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
		potential over reliance upon mitigation planting to screen the proposals without full attention to the potential impact of this screening on the landscape.” Could LCC please explain the rationale for the conclusion that there is an over reliance on mitigation planting and clarify what this means in terms of the effects. Could the Applicant please provide a response to paragraph 5.14?	<p>not create a screen or indeed screens the views of the historic landscape, then it can be argued that the Applicant’s plan to reduce the effects on visual receptors is purely reliant on mitigation planting. Apart from planting, there are no further mitigation measures. Moreover, the mitigation planting may detrimentally affect or harm the effects on visual receptors and views as mentioned. This action will compound the negative effects of the scheme.</p> <p>7000 acres are of the opinion that mitigation planting will not be successful in part due to localised browsing and as such the presence of poor planting along with exposed views of the Tillbridge Solar Schemes will harm views and visual receptors.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the use of hedge and tree planting to be an established means of mitigating visual effects for infrastructure projects. The expected growth rates, and reference to representative viewpoint 17 on Common Lane (Figure 12-14: A-H: Zones of Theoretical Visibility of the ES [APP-187]) as an indication of the level of screening from established hedgerows, are set out in Appendix A to the Applicant’s Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP3-061].</p> <p>Deer fencing will prevent browsing of planting stock. The Applicant acknowledges within the LVIA that there is a balance to be struck in terms of intentional screening of the Scheme against the loss of open views and character. The reduction in open views should be considered alongside the benefits of reinstating hedgerows that are likely to have been lost through agricultural intensification, whilst also providing wider biodiversity and green infrastructure value.</p>
Q1.11.1	7000 Acres	Planning Statement 6.14.30 states: <i>“The assessment of amenity effects in Chapter 14: Socio-economic and Land Use of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1] has considered effects from Chapter 16: Transport and Access, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity, and Chapter 6: Air Quality of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1]. It concludes that considering the residual effects of these assessments results, and the proposed mitigation including woodland and hedgerow planting, appropriate control measures during construction and decommissioning and the securement of design principles for the detailed design, there would be no receptors that would experience a significant effect on their amenity, and as such there would be no effect during all phases of the Scheme.”</i> How is this paragraph consistent with the conclusions on 'effect interactions' at ES Table 18-7 for certain residential receptors where 'significant effects' have been identified?	7000 Acres believe that the concept of amenity has been considered far too narrowly. Typically, the network of small roads is available to link footpaths and bridle ways, and provide amenity for residents for walking, cycling and riding. Transforming the landscape would damage the enjoyment of this amenity, reducing the positive health and wellbeing benefit people gain from exercising in a green space. The local villages have few “conventional” amenities, e.g. shops, cafés/restaurants, transport, however, what they have is a rural, green-space location which people have chosen to live in. This would undoubtedly be damaged by such extensive development as Tillbridge and other schemes.	<p>The Applicant’s full response to this question in relation to the differences in assessment methodologies of Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use [APP-045] and Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] of the ES was set out at Deadline 3 within Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>From a landscape and visual perspective, the Applicant has acknowledged the importance of minor roads to recreational amenity, including within Paragraph 12.6.110 of Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] and the baseline value (Table 1-1 in Appendix 12-4: LVIA Representative Viewpoints of the ES [APP-104]) and sensitivity (Appendix 12-6: Assessment of Visual Effects of the ES [REP3-008]). For example, for Viewpoint 5, Kexby Road, west of Glentworth, is representative of a rural road close to settlement that is noted as being of recreational value in the Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan (Ref 1-17). The Applicant has sought to limit views of the Scheme from such routes, through the use of setbacks; removal of panels from certain fields; and the provision of mitigation hedgerows, woodland and tree belts. A similar approach has been undertaken towards the open space and informal paths associated with Hemswell Hall, with the associated higher landscape and visual sensitivities recognising the amenity value of this location in an area where public access to the countryside is very limited.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that significant visual effects will arise for representative viewpoints 2 and 9 on Common Lane during the construction and operation (year 1) phases; and that the non-significant visual effects during operation (year 15) will nevertheless result in a very different character of enclosure through native hedgerows rather than long-range views. However, the Applicant considers that sections of some rural roads, including the majority of Common Lane, are of lower amenity value due to the more limited</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA's Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				<p>connectivity to PRoW and distance from settlement, the latter meaning that they are less attractive to recreational activities, particularly walking.</p> <p>Further to the above, the Applicant proposes two new permissive paths. Whilst the Applicant accepts that these will include views of solar infrastructure prior to the establishment of proposed screening hedgerows and trees, these will provide north-south traffic-free recreational connectivity where none exists at present.</p>
Q1.12.3	7000 Acres	How does the baseline report align to the requirements of the written ministerial statement “Solar and protecting our Food Security and Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land” issued on 15 May 2024? Ref: 6.2 Appendix 15-2 Agricultural Land Classification Baseline Report [APP-116].	<p>The Applicant has disregarded the qualification within the NPS that the case for agricultural land must be made first. Instead, they have focused on the classification of ALC grades, asserting that, because the much of the land is not strictly BMV, it will be assumed to be acceptable to be used in whatever quantity of area the Applicant demands. In practice, the land is productive farmland, and by disregarding this, the Applicant has failed to consider the requirements of the ministerial statement, which states that “developers must also have consideration for ongoing food production.”, and that “a greater onus on developers to show that the use of higher quality land is necessary”.</p> <p>Notably, the ministerial statement also highlighted the work the Government was doing to unlock rooftop solar development and the opportunity to reduce bills by fitting solar to homes.</p>	<p>The case for the use of agricultural land for the Scheme has already been made in the Planning Statement [REP3-027], Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [APP-035], Design and Access Statement [AS-031] and in the Applicant's responses to comments from Interested Parties throughout the Examination.</p> <p>The location and design of the Scheme is the result of a comprehensive site selection process that was environmental and planning led, to avoid and minimise impacts as early as possible. The Applicant's site selection process set out in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [APP-035] demonstrates that land was identified for the Scheme through the consideration of a number of factors, including ensuring it was located within an area of good solar irradiance and low lying topography, within a feasible distance to an available point of connection, avoiding urban areas and residential dwellings, ensuring access to the local highway network, avoiding Public Rights of Way where possible and avoiding environmental, planning and land use constraints where possible. This resulted in an area of land predominantly in agricultural use. Agricultural land use was a key consideration in the site selection process, and Grades 1 and 2 BMV land were excluded from further consideration within the initial 15km search area for the Scheme. On completion of the site specific ALC survey, small isolated areas of Grade 3a and 2 BMV land were found within the Principal Site boundary,, however the Applicant has avoided placing any potential permanent infrastructure on this land, resulting in only 0.07% of BMV land being potentially permanently lost to woodland, which has beneficial ecological effects, with the remainder of the BMV land being able to be returned to its original use following decommissioning of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has also considered food production in Table 2-16, pages 285 to 287 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-028], and Table 2-3, pages 21 to 23 of the Applicant's Response to Written Submissions at Deadline 1 [REP2-007], which explains that there are no likely significant effects across the construction and operational phases with regards to food production, considering that the Scheme area forms less than 1% of agricultural land available in Lincolnshire. Land can continue in agricultural production through the operational phase and that following operation, the majority of land used for the Scheme can revert back to current agricultural management, as set out in Section 14.8 of Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES [APP-045]. This is also supported by the Ministerial</p>

ExQ1	IP Name	ExA’s Question	Response at Deadline 3	Applicants Response at Deadline 4
				Statement which does not substantiate any concern that solar farm development presents any food security risk.

Appendix A WLDC Response to ExQ Q1.1.5

Table 2-2 Applicant’s response to WLDC Response to ExQ 1.1.5

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	WLDC consider that the sensitivity attributed to residents (people) should be higher. Based upon the assessment methodology, this does not materially affect the assessment outcomes in the Environmental Statement, but should be recognised in the planning balance.	Operation	<p>The sensitivity attributed to residents within the assessment of impacts on landscape and visual amenity is set out in Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] which has been carried out by a landscape specialist with 11 years’ experience working across a wide range of infrastructure schemes as set out in Appendix 1-3: EIA Statement of Competence of the ES [APP-053]. This assessment has taken account of GLVIA3 (Ref 1-18) relating to sensitivity levels as well as national and local policy relating to landscape.</p> <p>Planning policy does not set out how sensitivity should be attributed to people, as this is part of a technical assessment. Planning policy seeks to ensure that effects on the landscape and sensitive receptors are avoided, reduced or mitigated as far as possible, and where residual impacts remain that a judgement should be made to determine whether the benefits of a project outweigh those impacts.</p> <p>In coming to a conclusion on the planning balance of the Scheme in relation to landscape and visual amenity, the Applicant has considered both national and local policy, taking into account that NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) provides the primary policy for decisions by the Secretary of State in respect of energy NSIPs (paragraph 1.1.2).</p> <p>The sensitivity of residents has been considered within the planning balance, along with the fact that the Scheme has, in accordance with policy, undertaken an iterative design process which responds to policy requirements, published landscape character assessments and fieldwork analysis, in order to minimise harm to the landscape and reduce the visual effects of the Scheme. This has been achieved through a Scheme that is of good design which balances the need to generate a large amount of renewable energy, whilst responding to the local context and integrating the Scheme into its landscape setting, in accordance with national and local planning policies.</p> <p>Many principles have been incorporated into the Scheme design which have been considered in the planning balance, which includes (but is not limited to) not locating any solar infrastructure near Lincoln Cliff AGLV, providing buffers around residential properties whilst being cognisant of residents’ appreciation of open views, and providing permissive paths and ecological enhancement to enhance amenity and views in some areas.</p> <p>As set out in the Planning Statement [REP3-027], in section 7.4, the residual landscape and visual effects of the Scheme are localised affecting a small number of residential receptors and some extents of footpaths and public rights of way. Two of the viewpoints relate to views from Lincoln Cliff looking across the lower land below. Paragraph 4.1.7 of NPS EN-1 states that, for projects which qualify as CNP infrastructure (such as the Scheme), the need case will generally outweigh the residual effects in “<i>all but the most exceptional cases</i>”. Paragraph 4.2.15 similarly provides that residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for CNP infrastructure. None of the exceptional circumstances set out in paragraph 4.1.7 apply in respect of the Scheme. Whilst is it acknowledged that landscape and visual impacts weigh against the Scheme, this should only be afforded moderate negative weight in the planning balance given the CNP to deliver solar infrastructure, the time limited nature of the Scheme, and the localised visual impacts and impact relating to a local rather than national landscape designation.</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The proposal will have significant adverse impacts upon ‘The Cliff’ Landscape Character Area, failing to the conserve and enhance its qualities, character and distinctiveness. The proposal fails to minimise adverse visual impacts through high quality landscape design, and does not adequately demonstrate how the Scheme has responded positively to the landscape character.	Operation	<p>In coming to a conclusion on the planning balance of the Scheme in relation to The Cliff, the Applicant has considered both national and local policy, taking into account that NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) provides the primary policy for decisions by the Secretary of State (paragraph 1.1.2).</p> <p>As stated in Section 7.4 of the Planning Statement [REP3-028], the Applicant acknowledges that The Cliff is valued locally and is designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (Policy S62) (Ref 1-19), which seeks to ensure that proposals within or within the setting of the AGLV protect and conserve its value and qualities.</p> <p>The design evolution of the Scheme as set out in Chapter 4:Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [APP-035] and the Design and Access Statement [AS-031] demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to avoid, reduce and mitigate the landscape visual impacts of the Scheme upon this local landscape designation as far as practicable whilst also ensuring the delivery of a scheme where the presumption in favour of granting development consent (i.e. for critical national priority (CNP) infrastructure) is engaged.</p> <p>Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] concludes that although significant effects are anticipated on Local Landscape Character Area 2B: Lincoln Cliff – Harpswell during year 1 of operation, these reduce to not significant at year 15 of operation. In terms of visual effects, residual significant effects remain at year 15 at Viewpoint 7: B1398 Middle Street, Glentworth Cliff Farm, Viewpoint 9: Kexby Road, west of Glentworth Grange and Viewpoint 13: Public footpath (Hems/787/2) on Lincoln Cliff, Hemswell (Millfield), of which two of these relate to views from Lincoln Cliff looking across the lower land below. Although residual adverse effects remain on The Cliff, the Applicant notes that Policy S62 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan states that <i>“Where a proposal may result in adverse impacts, it may exceptionally be supported if the overriding benefits of the development demonstrably outweigh the harm – in such circumstances the harm should be minimised and mitigated through design and landscaping”</i>.</p> <p>As the Scheme will deliver infrastructure that is classed as a CNP (as set out in paragraph 3.3.62 of NPS EN-1) that will provide significant benefits at a national level, it is the Applicant’s view that the benefits of the Scheme in terms of the supply of renewable, low carbon energy generation outweigh the harm arising to the AGLV and other landscape receptors where residual significant effects are predicted. In addition, as the primary policy consideration, NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) expressly recognises at paragraph 5.10.5 that all energy NSIPs will have adverse effects on the landscape. Paragraph 5.10.12 of NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1) confirms that <i>“locally valued landscapes should not be used in themselves to refuse consent, as this may unduly restrict acceptable development.”</i></p> <p>As set out in the Planning Statement [REP3-027], in section 7.4, whilst is it acknowledged that landscape and visual impacts weigh against the Scheme, this should only be afforded moderate negative weight in the planning balance given the CNP to deliver solar infrastructure, the time limited nature of the Scheme, and the localised visual impacts and impact relating to a local rather than national landscape designation.</p>
Landscape and Visual Amenity	The cumulative impacts of the proposal with other solar electricity generating station projects upon landscape character, visual effects and amenity will be significant and	Construction Operation Decommissioning	The Applicant acknowledges in Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] and section 6 and 7 of the Planning Statement [REP3-028] that the Scheme would result in significant cumulative effects on Local Landscape Character Area 3A Till Vale at year 15 of operation, and significant visual effects at two viewpoints, namely Viewpoint 7 on the B1398

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
	<p>adverse. WLDC consider the impacts to be contrary to national and local statutory planning policies, and the proposal should be refused development consent for such reasons.</p> <p>WLDC consider that unacceptable cumulative impacts will be experienced with Tillbridge Solar Project being added to the impacts caused by the consented Gate Burton Energy Park and Cottam Solar Project. Such impacts would be further exacerbated should the West Burton Solar Project receive consent.</p>		<p>Middle Street, Glentworth Cliff Farm and Viewpoint 13 at public footpath (Hems/787/2) on Lincoln Cliff, Hemswell at year 15 of operation.</p> <p>However, taking national and local policy into consideration, noting that the NPS provides the primary policy for decisions by the Secretary of State (paragraph 1.1.2 of NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1), the Applicant concludes that whilst it is acknowledged that landscape and visual impacts weigh against the Scheme, this should only be afforded moderate negative weight in the planning balance given the CNP to deliver solar infrastructure, the time limited nature of the Scheme, and the visual impacts relating to a local rather than national landscape designations. By contrast, the benefits of the Scheme are very substantial (in terms of climate change) and significant (in terms of ecology and nature conservation) at both a national, regional and local level, leading to an overwhelming balance in favour of granting development consent for the Scheme. In terms of Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008 (Ref 1-12), the benefits of the Scheme clearly and decisively outweigh its limited and localised residual adverse impacts.</p> <p>It should be noted that development consent was recently granted for the Gate Burton Energy Park (12 July 2024) and the Cottam Solar Project on (5 September 2024). Both projects are located within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility of the Scheme. The Secretary of State concluded that while the cumulative effects of the Gate Burton and Cottam projects, in combination with each other as well as the West Burton and Tillbridge projects, would lead to moderate adverse landscape effects and material harm to landscape character, there are no significant adverse cumulative effects on visual receptors. The Secretary of State, in deciding to grant development consent for both projects, concluded that the landscape harms, including cumulatively with other solar projects in the area (including the Scheme), were clearly outweighed by the substantial weight to be attached to the critical and urgent need to deliver low-carbon and renewable energy. These recent decisions are important and relevant in assessing the merits of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further, development consent was granted for the West Burton Solar Project on 24 January 2025. Whilst the Secretary of State agreed with the ExA that harm would arise from landscape and visual effects in combination with the other Schemes, including Tillbridge, the ExA concluded at paragraph 5.3.10 of its Recommendation Report that this would not offset the benefits of the proposed development. This most recent decision further affirms the Applicant's position that, in terms of Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008, the benefits of the Scheme clearly and decisively outweigh its limited and localised residual adverse impacts when considered on its own and in combination with the other Schemes.</p>
Landscape and Visual Amenity	<p>The site design process has resulted in associated development (substation and BESS infrastructure) being located at prominent locations within the site closest to The Cliff AGLV. This results in these components contributing to a significant impact upon the most sensitive landscape within and adjacent to the Principal Site.</p> <p>WLDC does not understand why the design process has not mitigated this impact by locating such infrastructure in a manner that</p>	Operation	<p>As the Scheme is DC-coupled, the BESS will be dispersed across the Principal Site and co-located with the Solar Station (inverter, switchgear and transformer). The BESS will be located within and form part of the BESS-Solar Station compound. The BESS will not be located in a centralised location like the other consented AC-coupled Schemes. The design principles for the BESS and Solar Stations set out within the Outline Design Principles Statement [EN010142/APP/7.4(Rev03)] have been based on several factors including baseline environmental conditions – for example, the distance of BESS to residential properties. No BESS or Solar Stations will be close to the Lincoln Edge, with the eastern extent of the Principal Site comprising landscape and ecological enhancement areas and land retaining potential archaeology in situ (Sensitive Archaeological Sites). These areas will provide a buffer of approximately 600m from Middle Street to the closest land parcels comprising PV panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>With respect to the proximity of the Scheme to the Lincoln Edge/Cliff Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), as set out in paragraphs 6.4.36 and 6.4.37 of the Planning Statement [REP3-027], the Scheme</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
	<p>would minimise adverse impacts on the most sensitive landscape.</p> <p>The impact of the Associated Development is exacerbated due to the scheme design resulting in such infrastructure being scattered throughout the development site in prominent locations. WLDC does not understand why such infrastructure could not be located together in a single location within the site away from sensitive receptors.</p>		<p>has sought to minimise landscape and visual amenity impacts through design iteration, including sensitivities associated with the AGLV and the associated Cliff Landscape Character Area (LCA), as described in the West Lindsey Landscape Character Assessment. These are illustrated by the higher risk areas on Figure 12-1: Initial Site Appraisal Plan [APP-172] and Figure 12-2: Initial Site Constraints and Opportunities Plan of the ES [APP-173]. Ultimately, the design of the Scheme has sought to balance environmental constraints and opportunities through an iterative and evolving process, whilst seeking to deliver a Scheme that makes an efficient use of land and maximises the generation of secure and low carbon electricity in view of the critical national priority (CNP) to deliver renewable energy projects to meet legally binding targets to decarbonise the generation of electricity by 2035. All land within the Principal Site is necessary for the Scheme, either comprising land utilised for solar capable of generating sufficient electricity to fully utilise the export and import agreement with NGET and associated development, or land required and necessary for mitigation to minimise effects in relation to landscape, heritage and ecology.</p> <p>Direct landscape effects will arise for only a small proportion of the Lincoln Cliff AGLV area. North of Lincoln, the AGLV extends for approximately 20 km parallel to the Cliff. No solar infrastructure will be located within this area, although an access road will use an existing track from Middle Street. The remainder of the AGLV within the Principal Site will only comprise a biodiversity zone (with associated landscaping) and two Sensitive Archaeological Sites, as illustrated by Figure 3-1: Indicative Principal Site Layout of the ES [AS-055]. As set out within the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP.7.17(Rev04)], these will comprise more ecologically diverse habitats and green infrastructure that accords with CLLP Policy S62 (Ref 1-19) and published Landscape Character Assessment principles for management (Ref 1-20).</p>
Landscape and Visual Amenity	WLDC considers that the proposal fails to protect views from the village of Glentworth, as specified in the Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan, which contribute to the valued character of the Spring Line Village.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>The Applicant has provided a detailed response in relation to views specified in the Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan within the Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Report [REP3-061], reference 6.1.1. In summary, the Applicant considers that significant visual effects will be restricted to one out of the ten views (Viewpoint 10) within the Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan, on Middle Street near Glentworth Cliff Farm.</p> <p>As set out in the Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan (Ref 1-17), “<i>Development proposals that that would cause harm to Key Local Views will be supported where the benefits of the development outweigh the harm: in such circumstances the harm should be minimised and mitigated</i>”.</p> <p>The Scheme has sought to minimise impacts through design iteration and whilst long term, the residual landscape and localised visual effects will be temporary. The substantial benefits and need for the Scheme as set out in Section 5 of the Planning Statement [REP3-027] and confirmed in NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-1), including the delivery of CNP infrastructure to contribute towards meeting national energy and climate change objectives, outweighs the residual landscape effects when applying the planning balancing exercise to the Scheme.</p>
Ecology and Nature Conservation	Whilst WLDC agree that the study area is clearly set out on the assessment, most of the surveys appear to cease at the site boundary. WLDC would normally expect them to extend beyond the site boundary in	Construction	Table 9-2 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] sets out the ecological surveys undertaken to aid in characterising the baseline conditions, along with the justification as to the scope and extent of these surveys. Where appropriate, surveys were undertaken by the Applicant outside of the Order limits, e.g., breeding and non-breeding birds, Great Crested Newt, riparian mammals and Badger. The areas surveyed were determined in consideration of the zones of influence from potential impacts of the Scheme on relevant ecological features, the suitability of habitats to support the species of

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
	order to fully understand the ecological baseline.		interest and the presence of existing contemporary data. These surveys were also supported by an extensive desktop review and incorporation of collaborative datasets, derived from field surveys, from the three solar projects (Gate Burton Energy Park, Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project) that neighbour, or overlap with, the Order limits. The combination of these datasets characterised the ecological baseline.
Ecology and Nature Conservation	WLDC would welcome clarification and justification on how the conclusion of ‘minor benefit’ to species such as golden plover and skylark have been reached. WLDC understand that such species require open habitats and the proposal would seem to have a negative impact in that regard.	Construction Operation	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that this beneficial effect may not extend to all non-breeding bird species identified, however, for the non-breeding bird assemblage as a whole, the enhancement measures included within the Scheme will deliver a beneficial effect through provision of new planting of hedgerows and trees, areas of natural regeneration and creation of native grasslands, as set out in Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (page 9-193) of the ES [APP-040].</p> <p>Golden Plover was recorded sporadically during non-breeding bird surveys, with many observations pertaining only to groups of birds flying high over the Order limits. There were no records suggestive of a pattern of regular occurrence within the Order limits and observations mirror those recorded from surveys undertaken for the Gate Burton Energy Park, Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project, in that the species is widely distributed across the wider arable landscape in Lincolnshire. Irrespective of this, the large areas of permanent grassland created in the biodiversity zones and undeveloped areas on the western, southern and eastern peripheries of the Order limits will provide the open aspects required by the species.</p> <p>Equally, these grassland areas will be managed to ensure an over-winter seed resource is maintained for farmland passerines, such as Skylark.</p>
Ecology and Nature Conservation	<p>It appears to WLDC that no tree or structure surveys for bat roosts were undertaken.</p> <p>The assessment states that all roosts and potential roost features identified are outside the current footprint of the Scheme, and will therefore not be impacted. However, the plans show suitable features (trees and woodland blocks) within the site boundary and it is unclear why potential roosts are therefore considered to be outside the zone of influence of the works.</p>	Construction Operation	All trees and structures were subject to a ground level assessment for their suitability to support bat roosts as summarised in Table 9-2 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] and detailed in Appendix 9-9: Baseline Report for Bats of the ES [APP-090] . The results of these surveys informed the parameters secured in the Works Plans [REP2-004] , with a minimum 15m buffer applied to any tree or structure with bat roost suitability. Because measures are in place to avoid impacts on potential bat roosts, the Applicant does not consider further surveys to determine actual presence of bat roosts to be necessary. Specific measures for avoiding impacts on bats during construction are set out in Table 9-13 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] and the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] .
Ecology and Nature Conservation	It is not clear to WLDC if otter and water vole surveys were undertaken outside of the site boundary. WLDC understands that a failure to do this would not be complaint with current guidance and would welcome clarification on this matter.	Construction Operation	Table 9-2 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] sets out the justification for survey areas, with further detail included in Appendix 9-10: Baseline Report for Riparian Mammals of the ES [APP-091] . In combination with the extensive desktop review and incorporation of datasets from the three solar projects (Gate Burton Energy Park, Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project) that neighbour, or overlap with, the Order limits, the Applicant considers that the characterisation of the baseline for Otter and Water Vole is robust.
Ecology and Nature Conservation	Whilst WLDC acknowledges that the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) sets out measures to deal with the risk of encountering great crested newts,	Construction	Table 3-4 of the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] states that, <i>‘In the unlikely event that any Great Crested Newt are discovered during these works, then such works must cease immediately and a SQE [Suitably Qualified Ecologist] must be consulted to determine how to proceed.’</i>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
	it does not appear to detail the approach to be taken if they are encountered.		
Ecology and Nature Conservation	<p>WLDC noted that the Environmental Statement states that there may be indirect impacts to bats, but that these would be avoided through precautionary working method statements. WLDC is concerned, however, that no presence/absence surveys of structures/trees have been undertaken to determine if roosts are present and, if so, what their type and size are.</p> <p>It is also stated that a 15m buffer would be placed around all potential roosts to avoid impacts. In the absence of such survey data, WLDC would welcome clarification how that buffer distance can be determined with sufficient confidence.</p>	Construction Operation	As set out in Table 9-13 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES [APP-040] and the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] , pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to support the baseline survey findings, the purpose of which is to ensure mitigation during the construction phase is based on the latest protected species information and Scheme design. Should there have been any changes to the Scheme design which could impact upon roosting bats, then mitigation measures will have updated accordingly. However, the existing commitment of avoiding works within a minimum of 15m of any tree or building with the potential to support roosting bats is considered sufficient to avoid impacts in the majority of scenarios.
Ecology and Nature Conservation	WLDC have concerns regarding the combined cumulative impact associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of this and other DCO solar schemes on ecology and biodiversity.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	Cumulative effects and interactions between the Scheme and other solar DCOs are assessed in Section 18.13 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)]. This concludes that there would be no significant cumulative effects on ecology and biodiversity due to the mitigation and management measures incorporated into cumulative projects.
Ecology and Nature Conservation	<p>WLDC have significant concerns regarding the lack of a co-ordinated approach to construction and restoration activity within the shared cable corridor. As each DCO is being made on its own terms to serve the project to which they relate, and due to the lack of commitment from developers to co-ordinate construction activity (either through a document secured as a 'requirement' or legal agreement), all developers will be able to implement their project without having any regard to restoration that may have taken place in connection with a project constructed before them.</p> <p>Aside from the unnecessary impact on restoration programmes, the enforcement process to determine what requires further restoration/maintenance, and which party is responsible for this, will be very difficult to establish.</p>	Construction Operation	<p>The Scheme and other solar DCOs have worked collaboratively during design development and environmental assessments, including identification of a shared Cable Route Corridor to minimise the extent of impacts, sharing baseline environment information and identification of shared mitigation measures. Consideration has also been given as to how habitat creations link with other proposed developments and more widely across the landscape to ensure any benefits are aligned. Further information on cumulative effects, mitigation and the approach taken to coordinate with the other solar DCOs is provided in the Joint Report on the Interrelationship with other NSIPs [REP3-031].</p> <p>While it is acknowledged that the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-031] is not secured by a DCO requirement, it is considered this is not appropriate given it relates to a range of matters which fall outside of the ambit of a DCO, including in respect of the other Schemes over which no one DCO has control. The Applicant still considers it reflects best practice engagement by the Applicant and the neighbouring schemes to work collaboratively to minimise effects on local communities. It should be noted that the Application submission includes an updated version of the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-031]. This will be further updated during examination to ensure that any new NSIPs are considered should these emerge or that the stage of applications already included in the report is updated.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the Applicant notes that the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/11(Rev04)] and Framework CEMP [REP3-033] contain commitments that the Scheme will regularly liaise with the other solar developers to ensure plans are co-</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			ordinated during the construction period as it relates to the Cable Route Corridor. These documents are secured by the requirements 7, 12 and 14 within the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] . The Applicant also notes that WLDC as the relevant planning authority will need to approve both the LEMP and CEMP secured by requirements 7 and 12 prior to construction.
Socio-economics and Land Use	<p>WLDC considers that there will be a long-term impact on tourism as a result of the Scheme during the construction phase.</p> <p>The influx of construction workers will materially decrease the availability of tourist accommodation, which will be further exacerbated on a cumulative basis with other DCO solar projects within West Lindsey.</p> <p>The significant reduction in the availability of tourist accommodation will, in WLDC's view, result in visitors seeking accommodation in different parts of the region, which will have a direct and indirect effect on tourism in the district.</p> <p>Once the construction period for all projects is complete (which will occur for a number of years), there is no certainty that the tourism sector will recover to its former level and, if so, how long this would take.</p> <p>None of these economic impacts have been assessed as part of the application.</p>	Operation	<p>In relation to tourism, the Applicant's EIA Scoping Report (refer to Appendix 1-1 of the ES [APP-051]) submitted to the Planning Inspectorate contained no stand-alone reference to an assessment of effects on tourism as no specific receptors, such as visitor attractions, had been identified within the defined Study Areas to justify such an assessment being needed. The Scoping Opinion response received from the Planning Inspectorate (refer to Appendix 1-2 of the ES [APP-052]) also did not request that such an assessment was provided. However, Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] did assess the impact on visitor views in the vicinity of the Scheme and the loss of long-distance views as relevant. This includes from Public Rights of Way (PRoW) which provide the main opportunity for recreation in this area. Accordingly, Chapter 14: Socioeconomics and Land Use of the ES [APP-045] also assessed impacts on PRoW users which could include visitors to the area, and the potential impact on visitor accommodation. On this basis, potential effects on tourists were assessed in the ES to the extent that effects on views from and use of PRoWs were set out which comprise the main matters of potential impact. The assessment concluded that there would be no significant effects.</p> <p>To validate the assessment in the ES, the Applicant has prepared a further assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on tourism within the Tourism Assessment presented in Appendix D of the Applicant's Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP3-061]. The assessment did not alter the conclusions set out in the ES with regards to likely significant effects, concluding that the impact of the Scheme on visitor expenditure, visitor attractions, recreation facilities and other tourism and recreation receptors, including visitor accommodation, is not significant during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use [APP-045] of the ES assesses that taking into account the residual effect assessment results of the air quality, noise, traffic and visual assessments, there are no residents, businesses or community facilities that would likely experience a significant effect on their amenity during construction from effects acting in combination. All other receptors are over 500 m away, beyond the study area, and would not experience effects in respect of their amenity, and this would include tourism and recreation receptors. Further details with respect to specific embedded mitigation measures relevant to minimising amenity impacts associated with air quality, noise and vibration and traffic, are set out Chapter 6: Air Quality [APP-037], Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [AS-006] and Chapter 16: Transport and Access [APP-047] of the ES, respectively.</p>
Socio-economics and Land Use	WLDC is unable to source an assessment of the loss of agricultural land to the agricultural sector. Such an assessment would include the potential loss of employment over the operational period of the Scheme.	Operation	<p>The Applicant has provided a detailed response in relation to the cumulative impacts on agricultural land within Appendix B of the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-028], which concludes that both the cumulative change of use of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land during the lifetime of the Scheme and other cumulative DCO and TCPA schemes, and the very limited permanent loss of BMV land, will be negligible and not significant in the context of the total amount of BMV land in Lincolnshire.</p> <p>In regard to an assessment of the loss of agricultural land on the agricultural sector, agricultural land quality was a key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process as set out in paragraph 4.5.13 of</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			<p>Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [APP-035] and paragraph 3.5.5 of the Design and Access Statement [AS-031].</p> <p>Chapter 15: Soils and Agriculture of the ES [APP-046] assesses the loss of agricultural land to the agricultural sector. This encompasses three key considerations: Agricultural Land Quality, Soil Resource, and Farming Circumstances.</p> <p>The loss of employment over the operational period of the Scheme is considered in Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES [APP-045]. This assesses that in the operational phase, an estimated 11 gross additional jobs will be created by the Scheme, and the Principal Site currently supports 10 gross jobs through agricultural activities. The total net employment effect is 0 jobs in the operational phase as a result. This demonstrates that there will not be an adverse but a neutral impact.</p>
Socio-economics and Land Use	WLDC notes that there is the potential for a fire event to occur at any location within the development site during all phases of the project. This risk must be weighed negatively in the planning balance, notwithstanding the measures set out in the Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	In terms of the concerns raised in relation to fire safety associated with BESS, the Application is supported by a Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (FBSMP) [EN010142/APP/7.13(Rev01)] . This will be updated during Examination to reflect the latest National Fire Chief Council's guidance once this becomes available. This will ensure that the Scheme incorporates the latest guidance delivering an optimum design solution with respect to fire safety. The Applicant has engaged with the Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service (LFRS) throughout the pre-application phase on the content of the FBSMP [EN010142/APP/7.13(Rev01)] , details of engagement is presented in the Consultation Report [APP-021] and Appendix I [APP-030] of the Consultation Report . The content of the FBSMP [APP-225] has been agreed with LFRS and paragraph 15.13 of the Lincolnshire County Council Local Impact Report [REP1A-001] states that LCC is satisfied that the FBSMP [EN010142/APP/7.13(Rev01)] meets the requirements set out in LCC's Fire Safety Position Statement provided during the pre-application phase.
Socio-economics and Land Use	The loss of agricultural land for food production represents a significant adverse impact. This impact is exacerbated by the cumulative effects of the loss of this type of land with other large scale solar NSIPs located within the West Lindsey District.	Construction Operation	<p>The Applicant has provided a detailed response in relation to the cumulative impacts to agricultural land within Appendix B of the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-028], which concludes that the impacts of the Scheme in isolation on BMV land is considered to be negligible when compared to the total amount of BMV land available in Lincolnshire. Further, even when the solar DCO projects and solar TCPA projects in Lincolnshire identified as part of the report are also considered alongside the Scheme, their cumulative impact on BMV land in Lincolnshire is still considered to be negligible.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the majority of projects will be temporary in nature, and the change of use of agricultural resource, including BMV land, is largely reversible at the end of most of these projects' lifetimes. The Applicant does recognise that some elements of these schemes such as substations, BESS and ecological or environmental enhancement measures such as planting, may not be removed subject to landowner discussions. However, the Applicant has undertaken a conservative assessment based on the information publicly available and concludes that, given the majority of impacts to agricultural land resource are reversible, the residual effect of the projects identified on BMV and non-BMV resource is not significant.</p> <p>The Applicant also considers that this temporary and permanent loss of BMV land would not undermine national food security, and that the implementation of large scale solar projects represents a significant and economically rational step forwards in the fight against the global climate emergency, which is currently the biggest threat to food security in the UK and globally.</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			<p>Additionally, the effect of the Scheme on agricultural land with regards to food production has been considered in Section 14.8 in Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES [APP-045]. There are no likely significant effects across the construction and operational phases with regards to food production, considering that the Scheme area forms less than 1% of agricultural land available in Lincolnshire and that following operation, the majority of land used for the Scheme can be reverted back to agricultural land.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] assesses the loss of agricultural land in combination with all cumulative solar schemes (Gate Burton Energy Park, West Burton Solar Project and the Cottam Solar Project and others set out in Table 18-22 in Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)]. This confirms that in combination with all cumulative solar developments that there is still not a significant effect on agricultural production. The area of agricultural land that would be temporarily taken out of agricultural use across all four schemes would equate to approximately 2.2% of agricultural land in Lincolnshire (with the majority of this land reverting back to agricultural use upon decommissioning of the different schemes).</p> <p>In addition, the recent effect of changes to the NPPF (Ref 1-4) with respect to food production must also be considered in the planning balance. The Applicant has set out its position on this matter in the Written Summary of the Applicant’s Oral Submissions submitted at Deadline 4 [EN010142/APP/9.34].</p>
Transport and Access	WLDC is unable to identify any data regarding potentially sensitive receptors in the Study Area. This includes clarification as to where the current baseline driver delay has been included in the analysis.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>The study area was agreed with LCC and NCC on 19th January 2023 (as the relevant local highways authorities (LHA) for the area of the Scheme) as the extent of the area potentially at risk from possible impacts arising from the Scheme. Section 16.4.12 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047] sets out the data sources used in the assessment. This includes extensive traffic survey data collected in 2022 and Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data. The growth factor applied to the 2022 traffic data, in establishing the 2026 levels, uses Industry Standard Methodology, with the resulting link flows and HGV proportions presented in Table 16-15 (Links) and Table 16-16 (Junctions) of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047] for development peak periods and a 24-hour period.</p> <p>This has allowed an assessment of the level of traffic generated on each link, compared with the baseline situation for development peak hours (i.e. 0600-0700 hours and 1900-2000 hours), to show both the absolute and percentage increase in flow (Table 16-17 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047]). Importantly, the total development plus baseline flow in the forecast year of 2026, is compared with the surveyed 2022 peak hour traffic flow (Table 16-18 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047]).</p> <p>The assessment of Driver Delay is discussed in Sections 16.8.12 and 16.8.13 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047]. Of the links experiencing flow increases of over 10%, the majority, i.e. all but four, would remain lower than existing traffic flows. Based on this, and per discussions with LCC and NCC through Scoping including at a meeting on 19th January 2023, it was agreed that additional traffic movements generated by the scheme would remain within the overall capacity of the network. It was thus agreed with the LHAs that driver delay was not likely to be significant, in accordance with IEMA Guidance (Ref 1-14), and that junction modelling was not necessary.</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			<p>The implication that junction capacity modelling would normally be found in a transport assessment for a development such as this, and it is an omission, is not correct. An assessment of environmental impact, including driver delay based on changes in traffic flow, is typical for Solar DCO applications where traffic flow impacts are off peak and limited to temporary construction phases. Whilst modelling is undertaken in some instances in some such projects, this is generally limited and usually targeted to address specific issues raised by an LHA. As stated, the LHAs are both in agreement that no junction capacity modelling is necessary.</p>
Transport and Access	<p>WLDC would welcome clarification on the approach to obtaining and reporting baseline data for pedestrians and cyclists. It appears to WLDC that there is a lack of such baseline data, which would enable an understanding of the impacts of severance, delay and amenity to non-motorised highway users.</p> <p>Such impacts have the potential to occur across all phases of the project, factoring in potential traffic impacts that may occur during the replacement of panels and other infrastructure throughout the life of the project.</p>	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>The establishment of the study area is described in 16.4.1 to 16.4.9 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047]. This has been agreed with the LHAs.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts of severance, delay and amenity to non-motorised highway users has been undertaken to the satisfaction of the LHAs, and in accordance with the methodology agreed with them. The Lincolnshire Local Impact Report states agreement that the assessment is reasonable in Paragraph 9.12. Nottinghamshire Local Impact Report states agreement on the assessment in Paragraph 5.29. Section 16.4.66 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047] establishes the criteria for determining the sensitivity of links for assessing effects on pedestrians and cyclists. The sensitivity criteria relate to the levels of pedestrian and cycle demand which would be expected (e.g. there would be higher demand expected in a town or village centre), and the extent to which there are pedestrian/cycle facilities provided. As it is inherently covered in the identification of the sensitivity of the link, it is not necessary or proportionate to require non-motorised user (NMU) surveys, and therefore no surveys were undertaken. The criteria to establish the sensitivity of links are applied in terms of severance, pedestrian delay and NMU amenity, all of which are effects which would impact pedestrians/cyclists. These criterion links through to Table 16-19 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP047], where the sensitivity for each route is presented.</p> <p>It is important to also highlight the PRoW Impact Assessment presented at Sections 16.8.39 to 16.8.47 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047]. This establishes the sensitivity of each PRoW, and the magnitude of impact. Effects on PRoW users will be limited, temporary and managed to minimise impacts. A Framework PRoW Management Plan [REP3-041] has been provided, which is secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] seeking the submission and approval by the relevant planning authority of a detailed PRoW Management Plan, which will need to be substantially in accordance with the Framework PRoW Management Plan [REP3-041] and implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p>
Transport and Access	Clarification is required to confirm the application of the IEMA guidance to giving ‘special consideration’ to non-motorised users with regard to fear and intimidation.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>The IEMA Guidance (Ref 1-14) at paragraph 3.36 states “<i>while most of these factors can be quantified, there will be a need for judgement to be exercised in determining the degree of fear and intimidation.</i>” The application of this judgment is explained throughout the ES and in response to the same comments made by WLDC in its LIR. The IEMA guidance states the “<i>special consideration should be given to areas where there are likely to be particular problems.</i>” It then goes on to provide a list of “such as” examples which could be considered.</p> <p>Special consideration of such factors has been applied to the consideration of the sensitivity of links, as shown in Table 16-19 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047]. A number of locations have been assessed as people of medium sensitivity, notably ATC20, ATC22, ATC23 and ATC25. This is the second highest category, and reflects the location as a main vehicular route in a built up area with pedestrian and cycle facilities. The presence of key amenities such as Sturton by Stow Primary School</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			<p>also informed the allocation of the second highest sensitivity category. Paragraph 16.8.20 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047] states that the receptors and receptor sensitivity for fear and intimidations is aligned to those set out within the aforementioned Table 16-19. This is based on the same judgment as set out above.</p> <p>Whilst the level of HGVs increases on these links, there are multiple factors which contribute to perception of fear and intimidation. These include the total volume of traffic, vehicle speed and width of pavements, as set out in paragraphs 3.33 of the IEMA Guidelines (Ref 1-14) and in the associated comments within the Local Impact Report. Overall, it was assessed that there would be a negligible change in fear and intimidation levels on these links based on the empirical analysis set out in Table 16-22, and there is not considered to be additional justification to increase the level of effect with consideration to the IEMA Guidelines. Therefore the effect is not significant. However, it is important to recognise that Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047] has highlighted that there will be a significant adverse effect on NMUs in terms of severance, pedestrian delay and NMU amenity at ATC23.</p>
Transport and Access	With regards to the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), WLDC wishes for the applicant to provide the measures to be adopted in the event two or more projects are being constructed simultaneously. The approach should then be replicated in the control document for each cumulative project to enable communities to understand the traffic related activities in the area, and how developers have sought to minimise impacts during the construction phase.	Construction	<p>Cumulative effects and interactions between the Scheme and other solar DCOs within the surrounding area are assessed in Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rcv02)]. This includes detailed analysis of the potential cumulative traffic and transport effects of the NSIP schemes. The Application is also supported by a Joint Report on Interrelationships between Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects [REP3-031, APP-216 and APP-217] in conjunction with the Gate Burton Energy Park [EN010131], the Cottam Solar Farm [EN010133] and the West Burton Solar Project [EN010132].</p> <p>This evidence has established that there would not be a significant adverse cumulative impact in transport terms, in the extremely unlikely event that the peaks of the four cumulative projects occur at the same time. Thus, there are not significant impacts requiring additional measures to control cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Scheme and other solar DCOs (Gate Burton Energy Park [EN010131], the Cottam Solar Project [EN010133] and the West Burton Solar Project [EN010132]) have worked collaboratively during design development and environmental assessments, including identification of a shared Cable Route Corridor, sharing baseline environment information and identification of shared mitigation measures. The Applicant has responded to a question about this cooperation in respect of construction traffic within its Applicant's Response to ExQ1s [REP3-062] at Q1.1.14.</p> <p>In addition, it is noted that there are requirements within the Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rcv04)] to liaise with the LHAs with regards the timing of works to be undertaken on the public highway (Section 7.1 and 7.2). It is anticipated that the LHAs will have the required oversight of all the schemes, and this liaison would be a mechanism where potential programme measures could be applied to minimise any potential cumulative impact, albeit such impacts would be unlikely to be significantly adverse.</p> <p>This Application, and any subsequent decision by the Secretary of State cannot however action the request by WLDC to replicate the approach to mitigating cumulative effects across the control documents (i.e., the CTMPs) for the other solar DCOs within the District, as these are subject to their own decisions and Orders. Further explanation of why this is appropriate is provided within the Applicant's Response</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			to ExQ1s [REP3-062] at Q1.1.14., and within the further response to WLDC and LCC’s comments in this regard on the same question within this document.
Transport and Access	<p>WLDC seeks clarification on whether there is scope for further mitigation to minimise impacts at the B1241 (ATC 23) located close to a Primary School (assessed as ‘moderate adverse (significant).</p>	Construction	<p>The Applicant notes that one significant adverse effect has been identified on the B1241 (ATC23), on a route which passes a primary school. The existence of a primary school is reflected in the sensitivity category for the link. The impact on ATC23 will be short term and temporary, as it will only be in use for the construction of the Cable Route Corridor in the vicinity of the B1241. As set out in Section 16.10 of Chapter 16: Transport and Access of the ES [APP-047], the duration of effect on this link is expected to be only for a period of several weeks. This is to be formally defined within the detailed CTMP, in addition to the programme of mitigation for agreement and implementation.</p> <p>It should be noted that a significant level of mitigation for the construction phase as a whole is proposed and secured through the Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)]. Section 8 of the Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] sets out the management measures to be put in place as mitigation during construction. These measures include securing construction worker hours, HGV routes avoiding sensitive areas where possible, HGV movements occurring outside of peak times, and banksmen being provided in areas where AIL movement tracking identifies a need. The Applicant considers that all appropriate mitigation that can be incorporated is included within the Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)], which was updated at Deadline 3 following further discussion with the Highways Authorities. Therefore, no further mitigation is proposed.</p>
Transport and Access	<p>WLDC objects to the application due to the combined cumulative impact of traffic and transport associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning of the schemes.</p> <p>The objection relates to the potential period of exposure to impacts that local communities may experience, and the un-coordinated approach between the projects with regard to construction activity.</p> <p>All consented projects are able to construct at any stage and for as long a period as they wish under the scope of the respective Development Consent Orders. The potential cumulative construction traffic could give rise to significant disruption to local communities, requiring significant traffic management and causing delays to journeys over a number of years.</p>	Construction	<p>Cumulative effects and interactions between the Scheme and other solar DCOs are assessed in Section 18.13 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)]. The Scheme and other solar DCOs have worked collaboratively during design development and environmental assessments, including identification of a shared Cable Route Corridor to minimise the extent of impacts, sharing baseline environment information and identification of shared mitigation measures. Further information on cumulative effects, mitigation and the approach taken to coordinate with the other solar DCOs is provided in the Joint Report on the Interrelationship with other NSIPs [REP3-031].</p> <p>While it is acknowledged that the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-031] is not secured by a DCO requirement, to do so is not considered appropriate given it relates to a range of matters which fall outside of the ambit of the DCO for Tillbridge Solar, including the activities of each Scheme, over which no one DCO has control. The Applicant still considers it reflects a best practice engagement by the Applicant and the neighbouring schemes to work collaboratively to minimise effects on local communities. It should be noted that the Application submission includes an updated version of the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-031]. This will be further updated during examination to ensure that any new NSIPs are considered should these emerge or that the stage of applications already included in the report is updated.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the Applicant notes that the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] and Framework CEMP [REP3-033] contain commitments that the Scheme will regularly liaise with the other solar developers to ensure plans are co-ordinated during the construction period as it relates to the Cable Route Corridor. These documents are secured by the requirements 7, 12 and14 within the draft DCO. The Applicant also notes that WLDC as</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			the relevant planning authority will need to approve both the LEMP and CEMP in accordance with the relevant requirements in the DCO prior to construction.
Soils and Agriculture	WLDC would welcome clarification on the approach to soil surveys in the Cable Route Corridor. It appears to WLDC that the Corridor has not been subject to a soil survey.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	Paragraph 3.1.2 of the Framework Soil Management Plan [REP1-051] sets out that a soil survey of the Cable Route Corridor will be undertaken prior to construction. Compliance with this commitment is secured through Requirement 18 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] , which provides that the detailed Soil Management Plan must be substantially in accordance with the Framework Soil Management Plan and must also be approved by the relevant local planning authorities).
Soils and Agriculture	The assessment of the effects on farming circumstances is unsatisfactory to WLDC as there is insufficient baseline information for a detailed assessment to be made, and an established methodology has not been used.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	As set out within paragraph 15.4.14 of Chapter 15: Soils and Agriculture of the ES [APP-046] , there is no current guidance on the assessment of farming circumstances. The approach taken for the EIA broadly follows the guidance from the now superseded Planning Policy Guidance Note 7 (PPS7) Annex B (Ref 1-21) which has remained a common approach for EIA in England. The same methodology was also adopted for the Cottam Solar Project [EN010133] and the West Burton Solar Project [EN010132] which have both been consented.
Soils and Agriculture	It is not clear why information from certain farm businesses affected by the Scheme have not been included in the assessment.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	All agricultural occupants of farmland impacted by the Scheme were contacted requesting interviews for farming circumstances baseline data; a response was received from five farm businesses in time to be incorporated within Chapter 15: Soils and Agriculture of the ES [APP-046] . As set out within paragraph 15.8.22 of Chapter 15: Soils and Agriculture of the ES [APP-046] , landowning farm businesses will receive an income from the Scheme's occupation of their land. As such, the Scheme will provide a new diversified enterprise for the farm businesses and the effect of the Scheme on the existing farm businesses is beneficial. Although it is recognised that for individual farm businesses on secure tenancy agreements, the Scheme would not be beneficial, interview results from the remaining farming businesses are not likely to change the overall conclusion.
Soils and Agriculture	WLDC would welcome further details to explain how the study areas have been defined, including an explanation of the rationale that informed the identification of the off-site buffer.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	No off-site buffer was identified for the Principal Site agricultural assessments. For ALC assessment, the assessment area is larger than the Order limits because of changes to the boundary through the EIA process. Soil resource data is derived from the ALC field work so the extent of assessment mirrors that of the ALC assessment. For farming circumstances, farmers are interviewed regarding their whole farm business and how the land within the Principal Site Order limits functions within that farm business.
Soils and Agriculture	WLDC considers the cumulative assessment in relation to soils to be very high level, and lacking detailed assessment of the likely impacts. Clarification on the weight given to the assumption that other projects will operate to a similar level of good practice would be welcome in determining residual impacts.	Construction Operation	The Applicant's cumulative assessment presented within Section 18.16 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] is consistent with WLDC's conclusion that the cumulative effects on soils are negligible. In accordance with Table 18-6 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] , the term 'neutral' has been used to describe effects: " <i>Where the combined impacts of the Scheme or cumulative impacts of the Scheme in association with other development upon an individual or collection of environmental receptors would be negligible and not significant (positive or negative)</i> ".
Climate Change	WLDC would welcome clarification on the extent to which temporal effects have informed the assessment. This relates how market uncertainty, technological development and asset degradation is assumed and factored into the assessment.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	The temporal scope of the assessment is based on the estimated construction, operational and decommissioning periods set out within Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)] , which includes a 60-year operational life. In accordance with Requirement 20 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] , the date of decommissioning of the Scheme must be no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning.

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
	This matter also includes consideration of the design assumption on the project lifecycle.		
Climate Change	<p>It is not clear to WLDC how the replacement of infrastructure (project components) has been accounted for in the assessment. The assessment does not justify or reason the degradation rates or whether degradation could be accelerated by climate change.</p> <p>Being unable to identify the likely failure rate of panels and the requirement to replace BESS and substation infrastructure during the lifespan of the consent, leaves the potential likely impacts during the operational phase unclear.</p> <p>As the DCO confers wide maintenance powers, WLDC has significant concerns about the extent of the project that could be 'replaced' without the impacts being assessed as part of the application, and without any control mechanisms imposed as part of the DCO.</p>	Construction	<p>The expected design life of Scheme components is set out in Table 3-1 of Chapter 3: Scheme Description of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)]. For details around the assumptions made in the calculations of emissions related to replacement components please refer to paragraph 7.3.24 of Chapter 7: Climate Change of the ES [APP-038]. Further information on the replacement rates used was also provided within Applicant's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP3-062].</p> <p>The degradation rates for PV panels, BESS and substation infrastructure have been based on applications for similar solar installations. The rates are conservative and exceed that declared in the relevant Environmental Product Declarations (EPD).</p> <p>Standard test conditions for Solar PV panels are generally at 25°C (International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) 61853-1, 201), therefore any increase in temperatures due to climate change in the Lincolnshire region is unlikely to be of a magnitude to accelerate the degradation of solar panels or other infrastructure to any significant extent. This degradation rate and the replacement of components, alongside regular planned maintenance during the lifespan of the Scheme is considered to account for any emissions that may arise due to the failure of components.</p> <p>In line with IEMA guidelines (Ref 1-3) on assessing GHG emissions in infrastructure, all emissions relating to maintenance and replacement of Scheme components have been considered within the GHG assessment as displayed in Table 7-14 within Chapter 7: Climate Change of the ES [APP-038].</p>
Climate Change	WLDC considers that more information is required as part of the decommissioning risk assessment. This relates to an apparent lack of assessment of the likelihood and consequences of impacts that will change with the baseline (e.g. warmer winters and wetter summers).	Decommissioning	The climate change risks associated with decommissioning will remain at the same significance level, despite the projected changes in climate. These risks are still considered to be "low". This is due to a low consequence of impact associated with climate related construction/ decommissioning risks. This is presented in Table 7-19 of Chapter 7: Climate Change of the ES [APP-038]
Climate Change	It appears that no decarbonisation rate is applied for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would occur as a result of low-carbon electricity from the scheme replacing electricity generated by natural gas-fuelled CCGT.	Operation	The projected decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid has been considered in relation to the power consumption of the Scheme. The energy output from the Scheme is expected to directly displace energy from marginal generation sources (most commonly CCGT within the UK). As it is unlikely that the carbon intensity of CCGT produced energy will vary over time, this is considered a reasonable comparison. Please refer to paragraphs 7.8.19 through 7.8.25 of Chapter 7: Climate Change of the ES [APP-038] for further details on the consideration of a CCGT without-project baseline.
Climate Change	The residual impact summary, Table 7-21, does not appear to include a summary for the CCR and ICCI assessment. It seems to simply cross reference back to the main assessment (e.g. Construction Operation identifying that no significant residual impacts	Construction Operation Decommissioning	Residual effects associated with the CCR and ICCI assessments are assessed for each specific risk, as can be found within Table 7-19 and Table 7-20 of Chapter 7: Climate Change of the ES [APP-038] . To avoid unnecessary duplication of the same text, the same tables were not included within Table 7-21 .

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
	were identified, the number of low significant impacts, and including the residual consequences of these). WLDC would welcome clarification on why the table has been presented in this manner.		
Noise and Vibration	<p>WLDC consider that cumulative noise impacts during construction require a firm and enforceable commitment to joint working between developers to minimise impacts. The current Joint Report on Interrelationships does not deliver this commitment and leaves the potential impacts unmitigated and un-minimised.</p> <p>The failure of the respective projects to commit to delivering a joint and co-ordinated approach to construction, that can be enforced through a DCO ‘requirement’ or joint legal agreement, results in each project being able to construct solely on their own terms, without regard to minimising cumulative impacts on the environment or communities.</p>	Construction	<p>The latest version of the Framework CEMP [REP3-033], submitted at Deadline 3, has specifically added text in Table 3-8 to address this matter. It states that “Regular liaison meetings will be held with other high-risk construction sites within 500m of the Scheme (or greater, if applicable), to ensure plans are coordinated and noise and vibration is minimised. It is important to understand the interactions of the off-site transport / deliveries which might be using the same routes.” The commitments within the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] are secured through Requirement 12 of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)].</p>
Noise and Vibration	Clarification on the conditions that triggered the removal of noise data would be welcomed.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>The Applicant has discussed this matter with WLDC, and these discussions are set out in the Statement of Common Ground with West Lindsey District Council [EN010142/APP/9.8(Rev02)]. The Applicants position is that while it is acknowledged that the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-031] is not secured by a DCO requirement, doing so would not be appropriate given it relates to a range of matters which fall outside of the ambit of the DCO, and given it controls each of the four Schemes which are subject to their own DCOs and which the DCO for Tillbridge Solar cannot control. The Applicant still considers it reflects a best practice engagement by the Applicant and the neighbouring schemes to work collaboratively to minimise effects on local communities. The latest version of the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-031] was submitted at Deadline 3. This will be further updated during examination to ensure that any new NSIPs are considered should these emerge or that the stage of applications already included in the report is updated.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the Applicant notes that the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] and Framework CEMP [REP3-033] contain commitments that the Scheme will regularly liaise with the other solar developers to ensure plans are co-ordinated during the construction period as it relates to the Cable Route Corridor. In particular, collaboration on noise and vibration is committed to in Table 3-8, page 55 and 56 of the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] as stated in paragraph 18.14.4 of Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.1(Rev02)]. These documents are secured by the requirements 7, 12 and14 within the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)]. The Applicant also notes that WLDC as the relevant planning authority will need to approve both the LEMP and CEMP in accordance with the relevant requirements in the DCO prior to construction.</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			Further discussion as to the appropriateness of such a requirement is included in response to WLDC’s earlier comments in this document at Q1.14.1.
Noise and Vibration	It appears that no construction vibration impacts are presented. Clarification of the reason why is required (e.g. distances from receptors are sufficient).	Construction	<p>Assuming this comment refers to the baseline monitoring, the Applicant can confirm that periods during which either the wind speed was greater than 5 m/s or the rainfall was greater than 1 mm were omitted from the results. This is in line with BS 7445-1: Description and measurement of environmental noise (Ref 1-22) which was quoted as part of the methodology within Appendix 13-3: Baseline Noise Survey of the ES [APP-113].</p> <p>Construction vibration effects are considered on page 39 of Section 13.8 of Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration of the ES [AS-006] where the distance of works to receptors is discussed and prior warning committed to through the Framework CEMP [REP3-033].</p>
Water Environment	There are several impacts on the water environment as a result of the Scheme. This includes increased flood risk, pollution from surface water runoff, increased water volume discharge and inappropriate wastewater disposal, among others.	Operation	The Applicant disagrees with the summarisation of Chapter 10: Water Environment of the ES [REP3-012] as having found “ <i>several impacts on the water environment</i> ” and a risk of flooding and drainage. With the implementation of mitigation, no significant residual effects have been identified within Chapter 10: Water Environment of the ES [REP3-012] and Appendix 10-3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES [EN010142/APP/6.2(Rev02)] . Mitigation proposed and its securing mechanisms are summarised within the Environmental Mitigation and Commitments Register [REP3-020] .
Water Environment	The risk of flooding and drainage remain key concerns for WLDC. The preparation and implementation of mitigation measures to a high quality is required.	Operation	<p>This includes the preparation of detailed drainage design in accordance with Appendix 10-4: Outline Drainage Strategy of the ES [APP-098], which includes suitable allowances for climate change. The Outline Drainage Strategy mimics natural drainage conditions on site. The Outline Drainage Strategy demonstrates that, with appropriate mitigation, including attenuation, for any additional impermeable areas, surface water flood risk will not increase as a result of the Scheme. Surface water discharge rates off site are limited to the greenfield runoff rate and reduction in peak runoff rates is provided for the design storm event.</p> <p>In addition, Requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] requires that the detailed design is in accordance with the Outline Drainage Strategy contained at Appendix 10-4: Outline Drainage Strategy of the ES [APP-098] thereby ensuring the implementation of surface water drainage in accordance with the principles established at the Application stage. Requirement 10 (surface and foul water drainage) of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)]REP3-047] also confirms that no part of the authorised development may commence until details of a surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, the written details need to be substantially in accordance with the Outline Drainage Strategy and the approved scheme must be implemented as approved.</p> <p>The Framework CEMP [REP3-033] includes measures to manage flood risk (pages 43-46) during construction with requirement 12 (construction environmental management plan) of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)] requiring the approval of a full CEMP to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] and construction works to be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Finally, the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)] also includes measures to manage flood risk and drainage (pages 1822) during operation with requirement 13 (Operational environmental management plan) of the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)5] requiring the approval</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			of a full OEMP to be substantially in accordance with the FOEMP and construction works to be caried out in accordance with the approved details.
Ground Conditions	WLDC seeks clarification that the assessment methodology is informed by, and is compliant with, Government and/or DMRB methodologies. If this is not the case, an explanation of the robustness of the approach taken would be welcomed.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	As set out within Appendix 1-1: EIA Scoping Report of the ES [APP-051], a full ground conditions assessment was scoped out of the EIA on the basis of the Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) which was appended to the Scoping Report and that the effects from the Scheme are unlikely to be significant with good practice construction methods set out within the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] . This approach was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate within their Scoping Opinion (Appendix 1-2: EIA Scoping Opinion of the ES [APP-052]) subject to a preliminary risk assessment also being completed for the Cable Route Corridor. The Preliminary Risk Assessments for the Principal Site and the Cable Route Corridor are provided within Appendices 17-3: Ground Conditions Principal Site Preliminary Risk Assessment and Appendix 17-4: Ground Conditions Cable Route Corridor Preliminary Risk Assessment of the ES [APP-121, APP-122] respectively. The preliminary risks assessments consider land contamination but also other risks associated with ground conditions, such as ground instability and the risk of unexploded ordnance. In accordance with the Framework CEMP [REP3-033] , a site investigation would be undertaken prior to the commencement of development to inform any requirements for remedial works. The results of the site investigation and the approach to any proposed remedial works would be submitted to the local planning authority and consulted on with the Environment Agency, where relevant. Section 17.5 of Chapter 17: Other Environmental Topics of the ES [APP-048] provides a brief overview of the preliminary risk assessments and mitigation incorporated within the Application documents but does not set out a full assessment.
Ground Conditions	Potential effects on mineral resources or geologically sensitive receptors, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), do not seem to have been explained or considered.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>Potential for impacts on mining / mineral sites through loss of mineral resource was considered as set out within paragraph 17.5.19, bullet (e) of Chapter 17: Other Environmental Topics of the ES [APP-048], on the basis of mining and mineral extraction sites identified within Appendices 17-3 and Appendix 17-4 of the ES [APP-121, APP122]. No impact was identified. There are no geological designated sites within the study area.</p> <p>In addition, Section 6.15 of the Planning Statement [REP3-027] sets out the potential effect of the Scheme on mineral resources confirming compliance with local planning policy.</p>
Ground Conditions	The two study areas (Principal Site and Cable Route Corridor) have not been defined in the ES chapter.	Construction Operation Decommissioning	The study area for Principal Site and Cable Route Corridor is defined within paragraph 17.5.5 of Chapter 17: Other Environmental Topics of the ES [APP-048], which states that: “ <i>The Study Area for the desk-based review and walkover was defined as the Order limits plus a 250m radius, which is the distance over which significant effects of human health and controlled water receptors can reasonably have a potential to occur.</i> ”
Glint and Glare	WLDC would welcome clarification as to whether consideration has been given to views from upper floors of properties. It is unclear as to whether they have been considered.	Construction	As set out in paragraph 4.22 of Appendix 17-2: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES [APP-120], an observer height of 2m was utilised for residential receptors, as this is a typical height for a ground floor window. Modelling is typically only undertaken for ground floor receptors because these are most likely to be occupied during daylight hours (given upstairs rooms are typically bedrooms). The assessment concluded that none of the residential receptors would be impacted by glare.
Air Quality	WLDC considers that the scheme in solus will give rise to a risk of air quality degradation during the construction phase. These impacts will be further increased	Construction	As outlined in Chapter 17: Other Environmental Topics of the ES [APP-048], the results of the assessment indicate that there will not be any significant effects on air quality as a result of the construction phase of the Scheme.

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
	<p>should projects be constructed on a cumulative basis (either in sequence or all at the same time).</p> <p>The lack of an enforceable co-ordinated approach between developers results in no further mitigation being applied to minimise effects between projects.</p>		<p>The Applicant notes that the Framework LEMP [EN010142/APP/7.17(Rev04)], Framework CTMP [EN010142/APP/7.11(Rev04)] and Framework CEMP [REP3-033] contain commitments that the Scheme will regularly liaise with the other solar developers to ensure plans are co-ordinated during the construction period as it relates to the Cable Route Corridor. These documents are secured by the requirements 7, 12 and 14 within the draft DCO [EN010142/APP/3.1(Rev05)]. The Applicant also notes that WLDC as the relevant planning authority will need to approve both the LEMP and CEMP in accordance with the relevant requirements in the DCO prior to construction.</p>
Materials and Waste	<p>The Scheme will generate substantial quantities of both construction materials and wastewater. Employee activity will generate commercial, food and sewage waste.</p>	Construction	<p>As outlined in Chapter 17: Other Environmental Topics of the ES [APP-048] (Table 17-15) it is anticipated that during construction general waste from site offices and welfare facilities (including wastewater) will be minimal, i.e. less than 100 tonnes. Construction material wastage is estimated at 6,520 tonnes and as outlined in paragraph 17.8.39 overall construction waste effects considering available landfill capacity are anticipated to be slight and not significant. It is also noted that with the measures set out in the Framework CEMP [REP3-033], the waste recovery (landfill diversion) for the Scheme during construction is likely to be over 90% for the majority of construction wastes.</p>
Materials and Waste	<p>WLDC has significant concerns regarding the method for recycling materials as a consequence of maintenance (replacement) and decommissioning of panels, BESS and substation infrastructure. WLDC understands that there is insufficient capacity within the District, the Region and the UK as a whole to deal with the waste.</p> <p>The uncertainty of the replacement frequency and volume of panels, BESS and substation infrastructure, including duration of replacement construction activities, give rise to a potential significant impact that remains unassessed and not controlled under the scope of the dDCO.</p>	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Topic Paper which focuses on the cumulative assessment of waste, which forms Appendix A to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-028] submitted at Deadline 1. In order to provide a robust assessment, two scenarios have been considered in the Waste Topic Paper with different assumptions around recovery rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A “realistic worst case” of a 70% recovery rate, based on current and likely future recovery rates.• An “absolute worst case” based on the assumption that all construction and demolition waste goes to landfill. <p>The assessment of these two scenarios also assumes the “absolute worst case” that the market for solar panel recycling does not expand to meet demand as solar PV installations increase. Under the absolute worst case assessment (assuming zero recycling/recovery), cumulative impacts would be significant. Under the realistic worst case (70% recovery), cumulative impacts would be not significant. The Applicant updated the Framework OEMP [EN010142/APP/7.9(Rev03)] and Framework DEMP [REP3-037] at Deadline 1 to confirm commitment to recovering 70% of the waste from maintenance and decommissioning of the solar infrastructure.</p>
Other Environmental Matters	<p>It appears to WLDC that the project assessments do not take into account achieving positive mental and physical health outcomes.</p>	Construction Operation Decommissioning	<p>The assessment of effects on human health has been reported within Chapter 11: Human Health of the ES [APP-042]. This approach was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate via the EIA Scoping process (refer to Appendix 1-1: EIA Scoping Report of the ES [APP-051] and Appendix 1-2: EIA Scoping Opinion of the ES [APP-052]). The assessment follows the guidance set out within NHS England's Healthy Urban Development Unit's (HUDU) Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Toolkit 2019 (Ref 1-23) and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance “<i>Determining Significance For Human Health In Environmental Impact Assessment</i>” (Ref 1-24).</p> <p>Chapter 11: Human Health of the ES [APP-042] assesses potential effects of the Scheme on health and wellbeing of local residents. The assessment takes a holistic approach to health and considers a wide range of health determinants which are relevant to quality of life and amenity. The assessment considers elements of the Scheme which could affect physical and mental health (for example changes in landscape</p>

Topic	Key Planning Impact	Phase	Applicants Response
			<p>and visual amenity, noise, access to open space and employment) as well as physical health (for example associated with air pollution and In addition, and as noted above, Chapter 11: Human Health of the ES [APP-042] finds beneficial impacts on employment and income, prioritisation of walking and cycling routes (through new permissive paths) and climate change during operation, which will lead to positive effects on human health, including both physical and mental health. This positive effect provides alignment with the aims and priorities of the JSNA (Ref 1-25) and the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (Ref 1-26) through improving the provision of service and providing beneficial impacts on the priority areas of mental health. Whilst the Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised in relation to health and well-being, Chapter 11: Human Health of the ES [APP-042] does provide a holistic robust assessment of effects and through sensitive management during all phases of development as well as the Scheme including positive beneficial impacts, the Scheme is in accordance with Policy S54: Health and Wellbeing of the CLLP (Ref 1-19) as set out on pages 44 to 46 of Table 2 of Appendix B: Local Policy Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement [REP3-027].</p> <p>Further explanation on the approach to the assessment is presented within the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at ISH3 [EN010142/APP/9.34].</p>
Other Environmental Matters	WLDC considers that the ES does not directly address a number of health determinants including health-related behaviours, social environments and the bio-physical environment.		<p>The Applicant considers that these health determinants have been assessed within Chapter 11: Human Health of the ES [APP-042]. A summary of health determinants assessed and the basis for the assessment is provided within the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at ISH3 [EN010142/APP/9.34].</p>

3. References

- Ref 1-1 Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2024). Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1). Accessed on 09/01/2025 at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1>
- Ref 1-2 R ((on the application of Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) (Appellant) v Surrey County Council and others (Respondents) (2024). Accessed on 09/01/2025 at [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-3 IEMA (2022). Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-4 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2024). National Planning Policy Framework. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>
- Ref 1-5 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. Planning Practice Guidance (2024). Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>
- Ref 1-6 Historic England (2015). Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-7 National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) (2023). Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System Planning - Guidance for FRS. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-8 National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) (2023). 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at Ref 1-15<https://www.nfpa.org/standards> [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-9 Lincolnshire County Council (2016). Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/downloads/file/2361/core-strategy-and-development-management-policies>
- Ref 1-10 Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2024). National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). Accessed on 09/01/2025 at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3>
- Ref 1-11 Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2024). National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). Accessed on 09/01/2025 at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5>
- Ref 1-12 HMSO (2008). Planning Act 2008 (as amended). Accessed on 09/01/2025 at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/29/contents>
- Ref 1-13 HMSO (1990). Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Accessed on 09/01/2025 at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>
- Ref 1-14 IEMA (2023). Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-15 Department for Communities and Local Government (2013). Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7b5f04ed915d3ed9063f36/Planning_Act_2008_-_Guidance_on_associated_development_applications_for_major_infrastructure_projects.pdf
- Ref 1-16 English Heritage and Lincolnshire County Council (2011). The Historic Character of the County of Lincolnshire (The Historic Landscape Characterisation Project for Lincolnshire). Accessed 09/01/2025 at: <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/downloads/file/2205/the-historic-character-of-lincolnshire-pdf>
- Ref 1-17 West Lindsey District Council (2019). Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: <https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/planning-building-control/planning/neighbourhood-planning/glentworth-neighbourhood-plan>
- Ref 1-18 Landscape Institute & IEMA (2024). Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third edition. Accessed on 09/01/2024 at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-19 Lincolnshire County Council (2023). Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/adopted-local-plan-2023>
- Ref 1-20 West Lindsey District Council (1999). Landscape Character Assessment. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: <https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/planning-building-control/planning/planning-policy/evidence-base-monitoring/landscape-character-assessment>
- Ref 1-21 HMSO (2004). Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.
- Ref 1-22 BSI (2003). BS7445-1:2003 Description and measurement of environmental noise – Guide to quantities and procedures. Accessed on 09/01/2025 at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-23 NHS England's Healthy Urban Development Unit (2019) Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Toolkit 2019. Accessed on 11/11/2024 at: <https://www.healthyurbandevelopment.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/HUDU-Rapid-HIA-ToolOctober-2019.pdf>
- Ref 1-24 IEMA (2022) Determining Significance For Human Health In Environmental Impact Assessment. Accessed on 1/11/2024 at [REDACTED]
- Ref 1-25 Lincolnshire Health Intelligence Hub (2023) Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Accessed on 18/10/2024 at [REDACTED]

Ref 1-26 Lincolnshire County Council (2024) Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Lincolnshire. Accessed on 18/10/2024 at

