

Springwell Solar Farm

Statement of Common Ground
North Kesteven District Council

EN010149/APP/8.2.3
Revision 3
Deadline 5
October 2025
Springwell Energyfarm Ltd

Rule 8(1)(e)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination
Procedure) Rules 2010

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1. This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared in respect of the application for the proposed Springwell Solar Farm Development Consent Order ("the Application") made by Springwell Energyfarm Ltd ("the Applicant") to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").
- 1.1.2. Springwell Solar Farm is a proposed new solar farm and battery storage facility located in North Kesteven, Lincolnshire. The proposals also include infrastructure to connect Springwell to the National Grid, as well as any necessary supporting site infrastructure and environmental mitigation, including landscaping and ecological planting ("the Proposed Development").
- 1.1.3. It will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.
- 1.1.4. This Statement of Common Ground has been updated at Deadline 5 to reflect the final position between the Parties.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by the Applicant and North Kesteven District Council (NKDC). NKDC is the Host Local Planning Authority for the area and has been actively involved in the Application.
- 1.2.2 Collectively, the Applicant and NKDC are referred to as 'the parties.'
- 1.2.3 The matters of interest discussed with NKDC are detailed in **Section 4** of this SoCG.

1.3 Purpose of this document

- 1.3.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') is being submitted to the Examining Authority as an agreed final version between both parties. This SoCG has been amended as the examination progresses, enabling a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority as part of Deadline 5.
- 1.3.2 The SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities' Guidance on the examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects ('DLUHC Guidance')¹.
- 1.3.3 Paragraph 007 of the DLUHC Guidance comments that:

"A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree, or indeed disagree. A SoCG helps to ensure that the evidence at the examination focuses on the material differences between the

¹ Planning Act 2008: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (30 April 2024).

main parties and therefore makes best use of the lines of questioning pursued by the Examining Authority”.




- 1.3.4 The aim of this SoCG is, therefore, to provide a clear position on what has been agreed or not agreed between NKDC and the Applicant on matters relating to the Application.
- 1.3.5 The SoCG is intended to provide information for the examination process, facilitate a smooth and efficient examination, and manage the amount of material that needs to be submitted.
- 1.3.6 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/or the Planning Inspectorate’s website. (<https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010149/documents>).
- 1.3.7 This SoCG includes responses to topics raised within NKDC’s Relevant Representation submitted 13 February 2025. The issues that have been raised within the Relevant Representation by NKDC have been responded to within this SoCG, rather than duplicating the responses within the **Response to Relevant Representations [EN101049/APP/8.13] [REP1-070]**. Further issues were raised through the Local Impact Report and Written Representation made by NKDC. The Applicant has responded to this point within **Response to Deadline 1 Submissions, [EN010149/APP/8.20] [REP2-023]**. Ongoing engagement through the examinations on all these matters has been documented below within this statement
- 1.3.8 The final SoCG will be submitted to the Examining Authority that is examining the Application under section 37 of the PA 2008 for an order granting development consent for the Proposed Development.
- 1.3.9 For the purposes of examination, this SoCG addresses the following key topic areas:
 - Alternatives;
 - Approach to EIA;
 - Battery Storage;
 - Ecology and Biodiversity;
 - Climate;
 - Connecting to the Grid;
 - Construction;
 - Cultural Heritage;
 - Cumulative Effects;
 - Decommissioning;
 - Design;
 - Glint and Glare;
 - Landscape and Visual;
 - Land, Soil and Groundwater;



- Noise and Vibration;
- Operation;
- Population;
- Public Rights of Way and permissive footpaths;
- Traffic and Transport;
- Water; and
- Draft Development Consent Order and Requirements.

1.4 Terminology

1.4.1 This SoCG summarises the main topics covered and the status of the matter. The colour coding system used within the table in **Section 4** has been outlined below.

Cell	Status
	Agreed – indicates where an issue has been resolved.
	Under Discussion – indicates where points continue to be the subject of on-going discussions between the parties.
	Not Agreed – indicates a position where both parties have reached a final position that a matter cannot be agreed between them.

2. The Proposed Development

2.1 Proposed Development Description

- 2.1.1 The Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) array electricity generating facility with a total capacity exceeding 50 megawatts (MW), a Battery Energy Storage system (BESS) with an import and export connection to the National Grid Electricity Transmission.
- 2.1.2 The Proposed Development comprises the installation, construction and decommissioning works, with the details to be defined at detailed design and subject to approval by the Local Authority. The detailed design of the Proposed Development will be required to be undertaken within the parameters assessed in the Environmental Statement, which are secured through a range of control documents including the **Works Plans** [EN010149/APP/2.3] [APP-007], the **Design Commitments** [EN010149/APP/7.42] [REP3-030] and the requirements set out in the **Final Draft DCO** [EN010149/APP/3.1.5].
- 2.1.3 The design of the Proposed Development has evolved throughout the environmental assessment process to avoid or minimise environmental effects and in response to consultation and engagement feedback, where appropriate. The location of the Proposed Development is shown in **Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2, Figure 1.1: Location Plan** [EN010149/APP/6.2] [APP-058] and described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: Location of the Proposed Development** [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-042], with the consideration of alternatives and the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered** [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-044] .
- 2.1.4 The Proposed Development will be located within the 'Order Limits' (the land shown on the **Works Plans** [EN010149/APP/2.3] [APP-007] within which the Proposed Development can be constructed, operated and decommissioned). The extent of the Order Limits is shown on **ES Volume 2, Figure 1.2: Order Limits** [EN010149/APP/6.2] [APP-058]. The principal components of the Proposed Development include:
- Solar PV development including;
 - Ground-mounted Solar PV generating station. The generating station will include Solar PV modules and mounting structures;
 - Balance of Solar System (BoSS), which comprises inverters, transformers, and switchgear;
 - 400kV Grid Connection Corridor to connect the Springwell Substation and proposed National Grid Navenby Substation;
 - Satellite Collector Compounds comprising switchgear, transformers, ancillary equipment and operation, maintenance, security and welfare units;
 - A project substation (the 'Springwell Substation') compound, which will include substation, Main Collector Compound, switching and control equipment, office/control/welfare/security buildings, storage areas, and provisions for vehicular parking and material laydown;

- BESS compound, including batteries and associated inverters, transformers, switchgear and ancillary equipment and their containers, enclosures, monitoring systems, air conditioning, electrical cables, fire safety infrastructure and operation, maintenance, security and welfare facilities;
- Underground cabling will connect the Solar PV modules and BESS compound to the BoSS, Collector Compounds, and the Springwell Substation;
- Ancillary infrastructure works, including boundary treatments, security equipment, earthing devices, fencing, lighting, earthworks, surface water management, internal tracks and any other works identified as necessary to enable the Proposed Development;
- Landscaping, habitat management, biodiversity enhancement and amenity improvements; and
- Works to facilitate vehicular access to the Order Limits.

3. Record of Engagement

3.1. Summary of engagement

- 3.1.1. The Applicant has engaged with NKDC throughout the Development Consent Order application process, including during the early stages of the design and environmental assessment of the Proposed Development. Table 1 shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and NKDC in relation to the Application.
- 3.1.2. The Applicant built long-term working relationships with NKDC officers. This included holding regular meetings focused on planning and communications, scheduled fortnightly, from the close of Phase One Consultation on 7 March 2023 to the submission of the Application, as referred to in Appendix B2 - Stakeholder Engagement Undertaken outside of Formal Consultation. These fortnightly meetings continued through the pre-examination phase and into the examination period.
- 3.1.3. The primary purpose of the Planning and Communications meetings was to provide regular updates on the progress of the Proposed Development (including consultation and engagement activities), collect feedback on the evolving plans and highlight any concerns to ensure these could be addressed proactively through the design and assessment process.

Table 1 – Record of Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
11 October 2022	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Scheme of Investigation for geophysical survey sent for comment to the heritage team.
15 March 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward councillor engagement Update on planned resident design workshops
27 April 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback on residential design workshops
11 May 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of timing of informal consultation period on draft SoCC.
18 May 2023	Email correspondence with the Environmental Health Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence regarding the scope of the baseline noise monitoring, proposed monitoring locations and length of the survey, as well as proposed scope of the noise and vibration assessment. North Kesteven District Council agreed on the survey monitoring approach and requested to ensure that the proposed baseline monitoring locations are considered in the context of potentially noisy ancillary equipment. North Kesteven District Council agreed on the assessment approach but requested that the operational noise require rating noise levels to be a maximum of five decibels above measured

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		background levels, and requested for a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
01 June 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on contents of the draft SoCC. Topics discussed included the boundary of the inner zone, locations of the deposit points, the location and timings of public events, seldom heard groups and date of formal SoCC consultation
01 June 2023	Landscape and Design Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduced the approach to good design and the use of design principles Initial meeting via AAH Consultants regarding viewpoints and photomontage locations for LVIA to be agreed with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.
13 June 2023	Site Meeting with AAH Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of viewpoints and photomontage locations for LVIA.
29 June 2023	AAH technical memorandum 2 (AAH TM02)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on viewpoints and photomontage locations for LVIA.
03 July 2024	Landscape Meeting with AAH Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of viewpoints and photomontage locations for LVIA.
07 July 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on key changes made to the draft SoCC ahead of formal consultation (15 September – 13 October 2023) to take into account feedback from host authorities. Key changes included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revising the boundary of the inner zone to follow a 2- kilometer buffer around the proposed Site boundary, extending in some areas to consider the wider effects of the Proposed Development. Changing the location of a deposit point from Waddington Bar Library to The Venue, Navenby because it was less distant from the proposed Site. Adding an additional public event at The Venue, Navenby.
31 July 2023	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation on air quality assessment approach. The suggested assessment approach was accepted by North Kesteven District Council on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council.
15 August 2023	AAH technical Memorandum 3 (AAH TM03)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation that the LVIA viewpoints proposed for the PEIR were acceptable. Requested that all viewpoint photography should be taken in accordance with LI TGN 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals. Requested that a methodology for the visualisations

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<p>to be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion about the study area for LVIA and AAH TMO3 confirmed that the study areas proposed were appropriate subject to justification being presented in the LVIA and confirmation of there being no significant effects beyond these distances. • Landscape Character Areas described in the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment were discussed in early meetings and AAH TMO3 confirmed that LCA 6 (Lincoln Cliff) and LCA 13 (Fenland) could be scoped out subject to inclusion of a brief statement in the LVIA that recognises their proximity to the Order Limits and justification for their exclusion being presented in the LVIA.
14 September 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on design approach and design principles (copy of design principles issued post-meeting) • Discussion on matters arising from formal consultation on the draft SoCC. Key changes following formal consultation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Moving four public events forward to week 2 of the consultation to give consultees more time to engage before the end of the consultation period. • Update on timings for phase two consultation. • Discussion on ecology surveys undertaken and biodiversity design. North Kesteven District Council Ecologist agreed with the revised assessment of receptors to be scoped in and those to be scoped out on the proviso that wintering bird surveys and notable arable flora surveys should be carried out. The number of wintering bird survey visits could be curtailed if findings justify.
15 September 2023	Email and virtual meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed evaluation strategy along with the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial Investigation and Mapping report and Geophysical Survey results were sent to the heritage team. • Maintained request for trial trenching across entire Site without targeting for greatest potential ground impact.
19 October 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch of phase two consultation
02 November 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on progress of phase two consultation
16 November 2023	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward councillor engagement • Update on planned resident design workshops

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
16 January 2024	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarised noise survey results and refined proposed assessment criteria adopting fixed limits, which was agreed with North Kesteven District Council Environmental Health Team.
08 February 2024	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback on residential design workshops
08 February 2024	Landscape and Design Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on LVIA and design principles.
19 February 2024	AAH technical Memorandum 4 (AAH TM03)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions about the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation. Request for a cumulative assessment to be undertaken with the National Grid Substation. In the PEIR published at statutory consultation, a series of different options were put forward for various elements of the Proposed Development. It was requested that the ES clearly set out the parameters of the development, such as heights and locations of elements that have been used in the assessment, and the assessment be based on a 'worst-case' scenario. Potential impacts on landscape character in the vicinity of and views from the A15. Sought clarification on the extent of overhead lines. Request for height of fencing and CCTV to be reviewed. Request that details of vegetation removal be provided in the Environmental Statement. Request for planning policy discussed in the LVIA be updated to take account of any recent amendments to policy/guidance. Request for the Applicant to justify the buffers applied and raised initial concern about new landscaping 15m either side of PROWs. Request for greater level of detail covered regarding Landscape Character Areas compared to the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). Requested that the LVIA not report effects on landscape character with reference to the LCA 'as a whole' but rather consider effects on the part of the LCA in which the proposed Development is located. Request for reference to be made to <i>The Historic Character of the County of Lincolnshire</i>. Request for the A15 to be reclassified and that receptors are described as more susceptible to changes in the view. Confirmation of the methodology and assessment criteria and requested that where 'moderate' effects are considered to be 'not significant' a brief justification to be provided.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
29 February 2024	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key headlines from phase two consultation
18 March 2024	Virtual meeting with Conservation Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion about initial baseline setting assessment and response to the Scoping Report and Preliminary Environmental Information Report. More detailed setting assessment to be provided to justify scoping out of assets.
03 April 2024	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sought advice on the air quality assessment year of early decommissioning, following receipt of statutory consultation comments from North Kesteven District Council. North Kesteven District Council on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council confirmed the assessment year of early decommissioning at year 20.
04 April 2024	Landscape and Design Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion regarding Landscape Visual Impact Assessment content of the Environmental Statement. Discussion about matters from AAH technical Memorandum 4 (AAH) dated 19 February 2024 and highlighted above.
09 May 2024	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory consultation response discussion. North Kesteven District Council did not agree that hedgerows and hedgerow trees can be scoped out of the assessment and considered that habitat losses should be quantified within the Environmental Statement (ES) even if the habitat is scoped out of the assessment. The impact assessment can be proportionate to the relevant impacts and effects. North Kesteven District Council agreed with the rationale given for the scoping out of the named Local Wildlife Site. North Kesteven District Council did not agree that wintering birds can be scoped out of the operational impact assessment. North Kesteven District Council did not agree that badgers can be scoped out of the assessment as detailed information on the location of the setts has not been provided. North Kesteven District Council was of the opinion that scarce arable flora is a relevant receptor that needs to be addressed through appropriately timed specialist plant surveys. North Kesteven District Council queried the statement that no veteran trees had been identified. North Kesteven District Council noted that the habitat information within ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is not sufficient to evidence a BNG assessment.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
31 May 2024	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion about agricultural land classification survey outputs with North Kesteven District Council and RSK landscape specialist, who are acting on behalf of North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council as their soils specialist. Discussion of the summary of the soil types across the Site and survey results, alongside approach to the design development and consideration towards Best Most Versatile land. Discussion about feedback from PEIR, with particular reference to the production of a figure to show the agricultural land classification grades overlaid with the Zonal Masterplan and approach to land taken out of agricultural use.
June 2024	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion about the need to undertake a Mineral Safeguarding Assessment as part of the pre-application engagement that will form part of an appendix to the Planning Statement.
19 June 2024	Landscape Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion regarding Landscape Visual Impact Assessment content of the Environmental Statement and to discuss final viewpoint selection for the LVIA.
26 June 2024	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sought agreement on the changes on the scope of the air quality construction phase dust risk assessment. Changes were accepted by North Kesteven Council on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council.
27 June 2024	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approach to targeted consultation
05 July 2024	Meeting with North Kesteven District Council Climate Change Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement on the proposed methodology for the incorporation of the National Grid Navenby Substation into the climate Assessment
10 July 2024	AAH technical Memorandum 5 (AAH TM05)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation that the final viewpoint selection for the LVIA was acceptable and agreed.
11 July 2024	Email from AAH Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation that the photomontage locations for the LVIA were agreed.
11 July 2024	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on proposals for targeted consultation
23 July 2024	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed the findings of ecological surveys and further scheduled surveys to be carried out in Summer 2024. Suggestions about notable arable flora surveys were made to consider survey of maize fields as they are late sown crop and arable plants can emerge after summer rain.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed design updates with regards to proposals for removal of sections of Local Wildlife Site (LWS) calcareous grassland road verges. North Kesteven District Council considered that the LWS road verges were not of high quality, therefore had considered that seeding and improved long term management could improve the quality. Discussions about Biodiversity design. North Kesteven District Council noted a potential risk to barn owls and deers crossing the A15 due to habitat enhancement proposals.
25 July 2024	Virtual Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion about the Flood Risk Sequential Approach undertaken throughout the design development.
22 August 2024	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key headlines from targeted consultation Discussion on AoCM
12 September 2024	Planning and Communications Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on design approach including the use of design principles, response to feedback and the mechanisms by which good design will be secured via control documents in the draft DCO (including discussion of Design Commitments).
18 September 2024	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed to scope out vibration assessment during construction and decommissioning as works are considered to be far enough away, which was agreed with NKDC Environmental Health Team.
October 2024	Emails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing and discussing the short and long list criteria and the cumulative assessment
5 March 2025	Archaeological and trail trenching Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project update on dates and status Results of trenching and scope of outline WSI for post-DCO additional trenching and mitigation
2 April 2025	Built Heritage Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss around Built Heritage Assessment and the scope of works Levels of harm to listed buildings and conservation areas
3 April 2025	Socio-economic, Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss around the outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan, including objectives and themes Further Stakeholder Engagement
16 April 2025	Ecology and Biodiversity Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss around the BNG calculation and watercourses units Discuss around the potential need for an Ecology Steering Group, the BNG monitoring fee and the biodiversity enhancement fund
17 April 2025	Archaeological and trail trenching Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss the approach to archaeology and associated relevant representation comments.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
30 April 2025	Built Heritage Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed the assessment of designated heritage assets, including Conservation Areas, Scopwick Mill and Thompsons Bottom Farmhouse and had further discussion on the development of the design and consideration that has been afforded towards built heritage assets.
15 May 2025	Ecology and Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on outstanding matters on BNG, Ecological Steering Group, and points within the SoCG
19 June 2025	Discussion on s106 and side agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion about matters to be secured through a section 106 and potential draft Head of Terms, for example, look at the previous one approved by the Councils.
13 June 2025	Built Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email correspondence regarding Scopwick Mill and Thompson's Bottom Farmhouse. Applicant provided clarification regarding distance from Scopwick Mill to solar arrays (400 m and not 200 m as stated in the LIR) and reference to Viewpoint 19 for impacts Applicant provided a correction to information stated on call of 30th April regarding hedgerow screening on Warren Lane with reference to Viewpoint 29.
8 July 2025	Landscape and visual meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To establish and clarify matters of agreement/disagreement relating to landscape and visual effects, the oLEMP, landscape mitigation and design. It was acknowledged that there were relatively few areas of disagreement between the parties. Various matters were discussed/clarified.
11 July 2025	Built Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on built heritage, including assets listed within the SoCG.
13 August 2025	ISH3 - Action 14 (Tourism and PRoW Monitoring)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further discussions in relation to the data used to assess tourism effects and monitoring measures that could be put in place to understand the impact on tourism related to the use of PRoW and stepping out network Discussed the inherent difficulties in linking PRoW usage with a direct effect from the Proposed Development, given the number of variables and externalities, and broadly agreed that direct monitoring of a financial effect from the Project alone would be difficult
18 September 2025	Built Heritage and Archaeology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed information submitted for Deadline 3 and draft of updates to be provided at Deadline 4. Agreed that the level of information provided was sufficient. Agreed that the majority of effects were at lower end of less than substantial and not significant in EIA terms. Disagreement remaining



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<p>regarding the level of harm and significance of effect on Thompson’s Bottom Farm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussed updated oWSI submitted at Deadline 3, minor amendments to be made for submission at Deadline 4.
1 October 2025	Meeting with the Officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finalising of the SoCG outstanding issues

4. Current Position

4.1 Position of the Applicant and NKDC

- 4.1.1. The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and NKDC, following a series of meetings and discussions with respect to the key areas of the Proposed Development. This includes matters where discussions are ongoing.
- 4.1.2. This is a final position of the SoCG, addressing and identifying where changes have been made, and ultimately, documenting agreement and disagreement by both parties on relevant points.

Table 2 – Planning Policy

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
2-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	National policy	NKDC note that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is relevant national policy and the Applicant should reference the last version in preparing the Application.	<p>The Applicant has considered the most recent policies of the NPPF in the preparation of the Application.</p> <p>Appendix 3: Policy Compliance Assessment Table of the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] provides detailed evidence of compliance with relevant national and local policy documents. Table 4 provides an assessment of both the current and consulted NPPF.</p>	Agreed
2-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	National policy	Applicant should include a discussion of para. 181/footnote 62 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) with reference to the use of land for food production.	<p>The Applicant can confirm that all relevant aspects of the NPPF have been considered and assessed Appendix 3: Policy Compliance Assessment Table of the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018]. However, footnote 62 has now been removed from the NPPF and therefore is not of relevance.</p>	Agreed



Table 3 – Air Quality

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant’s Response	Status
3-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Local Impact Report	Embedded mitigation measures	NKDC notes that the Applicant should justify embedded mitigation measures for air quality. NKDC is satisfied that the oCEMP, oDEMP, and oCTMP consider all relevant matters and that the methods proposed are appropriate to minimise negative air quality impacts.	<p>Embedded mitigation measures are detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-046], including offsets from LWSs, woodlands, residential properties, and key infrastructure. Measures follow IAQM Guidance (v2.2, 2024) to minimise dust and exhaust emissions during construction.</p> <p>NKDC and the Applicant agree that the proposed embedded mitigation measures are appropriate and consistent with best practice to minimise air quality impacts.</p>	Agreed

Table 4 – Alternatives

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
4-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Alternatives site selection	<p>– NKDC comments about how the location of the grid connection has been considered in the site selection process, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That only sites around the grid connection point have been considered, and others should be considered e.g., offshore locations, rest of the country. • That the area immediately around the Connection point (along the A15) should be used rather than being distributed over a larger area. <p>That alternatives within a minimum 10km distance either side of the Cottam Socon network should be considered, rather than site selection being based on the need to minimise the length of the cable connection.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed these concerns within Table 1-1 of the Response to Action Points, Appendix 1 to the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [EN010149/APP/8.16] [REP1-073] and as discussed in ISH1, as set out in agenda no. 4 of Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [EN010149/APP/8.16] [REP1-073].</p> <p>Appendix 2, Solar Panel Siting Statement to the Planning Addendum [EN010149/APP/8.12] [REP1-069] further sets out the applicant's approach to site selection and the Applicant's site selection process.</p>	Agreed
4-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Alternative sites analysis	NKDC confirms agreement with the additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2 on alternatives and site selection.	The Applicant notes that maximising the grid connection offer aligns with NPS EN-1, which defines renewable generation as a Critical National Priority. The Proposed Development represents efficient land use (1MW per 2.4 acres) and seeks to minimise reliance on compulsory acquisition by working with a single landowner. The approach to BMV land considers NPS EN-3 guidance,	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>which does not prohibit development on BMV and requires a balanced assessment.</p> <p>NKDC and the Applicant agree that the additional information provided on alternatives and site selection is adequate and appropriately demonstrates compliance with NPS EN-1 and EN-3.</p>	
4-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Need for a new substation	<p>NKDC notes that the site selection analysis should demonstrate how the Applicant ruled out other points of connection, resulting in the need for a new substation. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All existing substations and 400kv across Lincolnshire and East Midlands Existing 33kv network through planning permission (14/0937/FUL), even if for a partial export. <p>Awaiting ExQ1 response / comments.</p>	<p>The Applicant started engagement with the National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) in November 2020 to discuss potential opportunities for a new connection offer within the target region identified above.</p> <p>Existing grid connection points / National Grid substations with spare capacity are finite. No grid connection offer was available to the Applicant at existing substations due to capacity restrictions in the target East Midlands region.</p> <p>The Applicant initially looked at opportunities to deliver a project of similar scale as the Proposed Development at substations where capacity existed, however, no such capacity was available with a connection date prior to 2033. As Section 7 of the Statement of Need [EN010149/APP/7.1] [APP-0135] sets out, the lack of viable alternative connections extends to a 50km radius from the Order Limits.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked closely with National Grid to determine where a new substation may be located and to understand the programme for its delivery. The Applicant's understands that a planning application for</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				Navenby substation will be made in early 2026. National Grid confirmed that they still expect to be able to connect the project to the National Grid in late 2029, as set out in the grid connection offer. As supported by National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC response to addressing Q1.1.1 within the Response to First Written Questions (ExQ1) [EN010149/APP/8.14] [REP1-071] .	
4-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Grid connection	<p>NKDC remains concerned that a grid connection may not be secured within the anticipated operational timeframe of the Proposed Development. NKDC considers the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation should either be treated as related infrastructure under EN-1 or the DCO should demonstrate that both developments can be integrated (complying with EN-1 paragraphs 4.11.7 to 4.11.9 , including cumulative effects in environmental assessments.</p> <p>NKDC remain concerned that the provisions of EN-1 paragraphs 4.11.7 to 4.11.9 cannot be fully met until the planning application for the NGNS has been submitted and determined. It is not possible for the Applicants to totally de-risk the provision of a grid connection</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that NPS EN-1 allows separate applications for different project elements (paragraphs 4.11.5 - 4.11.9). The Application includes information on the proposed Navenby Substation in ES Chapter 3 and the Grid Connection Statement, and cumulative effects have been assessed in ES Chapter 16. The substation is not required solely for this project, and National Grid is pursuing planning permission independently. These points have been addressed within Table 1-1 of the Response to Action Points, Appendix 1 to the Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [EN010149/APP/8.16] [REP1-073] and summarised its position in Agenda Item 4. This is also set out in the Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearings 2, 3 and 4 [EN010149/APP/8.22] [REP3-075] due to being discussed at ISH 4, Agenda Item 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has justified its position through the Examination and disagrees with the Council's suggested restrictions. NGET plans to submit its planning application</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>given that the NGNS is a separate proposal under a separate planning regime.</p> <p>If integration cannot be demonstrated, NKDC considers the DCO should include a legal mechanism to prevent development until grid connection agreements are secured and delivery timelines aligned. NKDC also support the suggested additional Requirement proposed by the ExA preventing commencement of the solar farm until the NGNS has received planning permission.</p> <p>NKDC set out their current position on the Grid Connection in the Comments to Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-026].</p> <p>NKDC expresses concern about the ability to evidence a grid connection within the anticipated operational timeframe of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>NKDC suggest that the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation should not be decoupled from the Proposed Development and that it constitutes related infrastructure under</p>	<p>in early 2026, with a decision expected by Spring 2026 and construction anticipated to be completed by late 2029. The delivery of the substation depends on NGET receiving permission and is outside the Applicant's control. The Applicant already holds a grid connection offer, and construction commencement will be commercially and operationally managed to ensure confidence in energy export. Restricting the Proposed Development based on the substation timeline is not justified and could impede timely renewable energy delivery. As stated in its Response to Examining Authority's Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Draft Development Consent Order [EN010149/APP/8.27] [REP4-050]. Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [EN010149/APP/8.25] [REP4-048] confirms that the Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the inter-project cumulative effects with other existing development and/or approved developments as presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013] which considers the National Grid Navenby Substation, Leoda Solar Farm and Fosse Green. This has been undertaken in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment, whereby the identification of other existing development and/or approved developments went through two stages, including identifying the long list and short list. The other existing development and/or approved development is</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>EN-1, or it should be demonstrated that both proposals can be progressed in an integrated way/ include the other within its environmental assessments.</p> <p>If this is not possible, the DCO should include a legal mechanism to prohibit development until grid connection agreements are in place/ delivery timeframes are aligned.</p>	<p>considered if sufficient environmental assessment information is readily and publicly available (including traffic flows) to inform the inter-project cumulative effects assessment. The assessment of each existing development and/or approved development on the short list will be proportionate to the environmental assessment information available. The Applicant has not considered applications on the TEC register where sufficient environmental information is not available to inform the assessment in line with the short list criteria set out within the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment.</p>	

Table 5 – Approach to EIA

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
5-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to EIA	NKDC comments that the final ES should clearly set out the parameters of the Proposed Development, and where these cannot be reasonably fixed, assessment should be based on a worst-case scenario.	<p>The parameters that have been assessed within the ES and would be secured as part of the Proposed Development are detailed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-022] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2.4] [REP4-015]. If there is optionality</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				retained in the design, a worst-case scenario has been assessed for each environmental factor.	
5-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Embedded mitigation measures	NKDC notes that the Applicant should justify the choice of buffer zone distances applied and whether these are a product of the technical assessments carried out, best practice, or both.	<p>The Applicant has incorporated minimum offsets to specific elements of the Proposed Development based on a combination of guidance, good practice, precedence set by other NSIP solar schemes and professional judgement from technical specialists of the project team.</p> <p>For example, there would be a minimum 15m offset from proposed built development to any existing woodland in accordance with guidance published by Natural England and the British Standards Institution for tree root protection areas.</p> <p>The study area for each environmental factor alongside the reasoning of why buffer distances have been applied and used for the assessment is included within Section 4 in each topic chapter of the ES Volume 1, Chapters 6-15 [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-046 to APP-055].</p>	Agreed
5-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Embedded mitigation measures	NKDC notes that the embedded mitigation measures in relation to agricultural land impacts cannot be accepted as national policy requires justification for, and avoidance of the use of any BMV land.	The Applicant has responded to the Council's ISH3 Oral Submissions Summary submitted at Deadline 3 within the Response to Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [EN010149/APP/8.26] [REP4-049] , Q2.9.1: Temporary or Permanent Effects , which has been submitted at Deadline 4.	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>The Council notes the information provided in relation to the site selection process, however, it remains concerned that the use of BMV land has not been adequately assessed and thus justified due to its concerns about how the loss of fixed equipment and green infrastructure has been assessed in the ES. See paragraphs 18.17-18.21 of the Council's Local Impact Report [REP1-102], the Council's ExAQ1 response [REP1-103] and ISH3 Oral Submissions Summary [REP3-080].</p>	<p>NPS EN-3 sets out a preference for the use of non-agricultural land in the first instance and subsequently lower grades of agricultural land, should this be required. However, NPS EN-3 asserts that land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of a site location and that the development of ground mounted solar arrays is not prohibited on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. NPS EN-3 further recognises that, at scale, it is likely that developments would use some agricultural land subject to the Applicant explaining their choice of site.</p> <p>As set out in the Appendix 1: Site Selection Report to the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] there is no brownfield land within the administrative area of North Kesteven District Council that has the capability of delivering the project objectives. It should also be noted that within Lincolnshire there is a significantly higher proportion of BMV (71.2%) in comparison to the national average (42%). While this does not simply give justification to propose solar development on BMV land, it sets the context that non-BMV land is less abundant.</p> <p>It is also important to recognise that land type is one of many factors that influence site selection and needs to be considered in a proportionate way. Nevertheless, the Applicant sought to avoid higher grades of agricultural</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				land (see Appendix 1: Site Selection Report to the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] and the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028]) and took appropriate mitigation measures to limit use of most productive land during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Applicant considers its approach to be reasoned and in accordance with the requirements of policy set out in NPSs EN-1 and EN-3.	
5-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Lifespan	NKDC agrees with the Applicant that the Proposed Development assessments assume a 40-year operational lifespan. NKDC notes that cumulative assessments should consider the likely permanence of the National Grid Navenby Substation (NGNS) and the presumption of repowering under NPSs/NPPF, and confirms that the Applicant's approach to these matters is acceptable.	The Applicant confirms that the NGNS does not form part of the Application, but cumulative effects have been assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 16 [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013] . Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5] Requirement 19 ensures each phase will be decommissioned after 40 years in compliance with the Planning Act 2008. The likely permanence of the NGNS is therefore not relevant to the assessment. Ongoing maintenance and replacement of parts during operation have been fully assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-022] , and the DCO only authorises maintenance, not works giving rise to materially new or different environmental effects. Controls are in place, and the 40-year operational lifetime of each phase is maintained.	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
5-5	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	National Grid Navenby Substation	<p>NKDC recommend that all relevant chapters must assess cumulative construction and operational effects of the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation as it is indivisible from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>NKDC continue to raise concerns about the alignment of the solar farm with the National Grid Navenby Substation due to potential delays in the substation achieving consent through the planning process which has been the subject of a further amendment to its timescale for the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>NKDC note the submission of an updated ES Chapter 16 and agree with the majority of its conclusions, however, given that National Grid did not provide information on the construction and operational traffic and transport impacts in their Scoping Report; it will not be possible to definitively assess the likely cumulative traffic and transport effects on the NGNS with the Springwell solar farm.</p>	<p>It is noted that the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation does not form part of the Application. However, in line with the EIA Regulations and case law, an assessment of the cumulative effects of the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation is detailed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013]. ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013] has been updated to account for the information detailed in the National Grid Navenby Substation EIA Scoping Report and to reflect that this project now falls into the short-list of developments considered in the assessment.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 acknowledges that it may not be possible to coordinate different elements of a projects that interface, and that different applications may be submitted for each element of a project (see paragraphs 4.11.5 – 4.11.9). NPS EN-1 sets out the requirements of the Applicant in the circumstance where elements are consented separately.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that as part of the National Grid's Planning Application, a cumulative assessment of the transport effects and other relevant EIA topics of both projects is required.</p>	Agreed

Table 6- Battery Storage

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
6-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Guidance	<p>NKDC notes that the Applicant should continue to engage with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, which has provided planning guidance for Grid Scale BESS.</p> <p>Other comments requested the Applicant to engage on points regarding required configuration of fire safety equipment, water storage tanks and shut off valve/s etc.</p> <p>NKDC have set out their position on BESS in paragraphs 25.13 - 25.14, 25.15 - 25.17, 25.18 - 25.20 and 20.10 of its LIR [REP1-102].</p>	<p>The Applicant has applied industry best practice to the design of the BESS, including the use of the NFCC (National Fire Chief Council) Guidance “Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS” and NFPA (National Fire Protection Association) 855 “Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems”.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with Lincolnshire FRS throughout the process, with ongoing dialogue on suitable preventative measures and response to any thermal runaway event. Comments received from the Lincolnshire FRS have been incorporated into the design of the BESS compound, oBSMP [EN010149/APP/7.14.2] [REP1-048] and the BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19.2] [REP1-052]. Part of the mitigations discussed and agreed with Lincolnshire FRS relate to the potential need for water to cool adjacent enclosures in the event of a fire. If required, the BESS compound can accommodate sufficient water storage over and above the minimum currently required under NFCC guidance. Appropriate</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>measures would be agreed with the Lincolnshire FRS during detailed design.</p> <p>In relation to NKDC Local Impact Report and Written Representations (25.13 - 25.14, 25.15 - 25.17, 25.18 - 25.20 and 20.10), please also see Table 2-15 of the Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [EN010149/APP/8.20] [REP2-023], statements set out for Agenda item 6 on page 20 of Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [EN010149/APP/8.16] [REP1-073] and Protective Provisions in Schedule 15 of the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5]. Discussions and agreements made directly with the LFRS can also be found in Appendix 1 Statement of Common Ground - Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service to the Statement of Common Ground – Lincolnshire County Council [EN010149/APP/8.1.3].</p>	Agreed
6-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Location of BESS	NKDC initially suggested that the BESS, main collector compound and Springwell Substation are focussed in Springwell East due to lesser landscape sensitivity. Other comments request justification for why the BESS cannot be provided on a smaller scale which could open up alternatives in Springwell East.	The Applicant's rationale behind the location of the BESS is due to it being as close to the project substation as reasonably possible, and is supported by the NKDC. If the project substation was in Springwell East, cables would run from the west to the east and then back again resulting in an increase in the EIA impacts as well as efficiency impacts.	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
6-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Scale	<p>NKDC continue to raise concerns re landscape and visual impact of BESS in Springwell West.</p> <p>NKDC initially stated that the proposed BESS is too large. Other comments requested more justification for the size of the BESS. In terms of associated development, NKDC recognises that the electricity storage capacity of the BESS is subservient to the generating capacity of the solar farm.</p> <p>NKDC continue to raise concerns re landscape and visual impact of BESS in Springwell West.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.10.10 within NPS EN-3 sets out that the government is supportive of solar development that is <i>"co-located with other functions (including storage) to maximise the efficiency of land use"</i>.</p> <p>The starting point for the size of the BESS is to make the best use of the National Grid connection agreement, and is supported by the NKDC. There is an urgent need to decarbonise the grid, and the BESS plays an important role balancing the grid. In any event, the size of the BESS is limited due to environmental considerations e.g. from environmental impact assessments like noise, and it is Associated Development to the principal development. The BESS facility has been sized to reflect the scale of the solar installation, as well as reflect the requirements for safe operation of the site, such as those in the NFCC Guidance.</p>	Agreed
6-4	LIR responses and Subsequent Correspondence Planning Committee	Type of Battery	<p>Paragraph 25.20 of NKDC's Local Impact Report [REP1-102] set out the Council consider that there is a need to agree the battery type proposed within the BESS as part of the requirement to agree the BSMP in view of the changing</p>	<p>The Applicant's view that the battery type is not a material planning matter and should not be set as part of any planning decision. Each battery type has their positives and negatives to consider; the Applicant would need to choose the best system available at the time based on a range of factors, with safety to site</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>market trends and the need to minimise the impact on human health following any major accident or disaster, and the 'perception of harm' to public amenity, safety and wellbeing as a material planning consideration.</p> <p>In summary, the Council's position is that battery choice/type ought to be a material planning consideration.</p>	<p>personnel, first responders and the general public being central to that consideration.</p>	

Table 7 – Ecology and Biodiversity

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
7-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to assessment	<p>NKDC agrees with the Applicant's approach to habitat and hedgerow survey methodology, including the need for a cross-discipline approach to identify hedgerows of importance on wildlife, landscape, and heritage grounds.</p> <p>Both parties agree that the habitat and hedgerow surveys are sufficient, cross-disciplinary, and have informed the design to minimise impacts on important hedgerows as far as practicable.</p> <p>..</p> <p>.</p>	<p>All habitats within the Order Limits have been field surveyed using UK habitat survey methodology and assessed in accordance with Biodiversity Net Gain methodology and for priority habitat status with reference to current definitions and suitable baseline data (ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3.3] [REP3-019]). Habitat is also quantified in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.14: Biodiversity Net Gain [EN010149/APP/6.3.3] [REP3-021] and within the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5].</p> <p>Hedgerows were also surveyed under the wildlife and landscape criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, with data used to inform the design of the Proposed Development, but this focused on the sections of hedge to be removed. A desk study was carried out to determine historical importance (ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019]). Hedgerows and trees with bat roost potential have been avoided where possible (ES Volume 2, Figure 7.2 [EN010149/APP/6.2] [APP-064]). Ten important hedgerows (wildlife/landscape) and two historically important hedgerows would be affected by vegetation removal proposals for cable installation and/or access</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
7-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Bats	NKDC notes that the site baseline is of regional to national importance for bats and agrees with the approach within the Bat Activity Survey Report, proposals for further surveys, and the resolution of operational lighting design.	<p>(ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.11: Important Hedgerow Survey [EN010149/APP/6.32] [REP3-017]).</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to bat assessment is set out in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Bat Activity Survey [EN010149/APP/6.3.2] [REP1-034], Appendix 7.6: Bat Activity Survey Addendum [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-087] and Appendix 7.13: Further Targeted Bat Activity Survey [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-094]. Lighting impacts have been addressed through design measures to minimise light spill, including motion detection or manually operated lighting during construction and operation, and use of infra-red security lighting which does not disturb bats. These measures are secured in the Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.42] [REP3-030] and discussed in the ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.13] [REP3-012].</p>	Agreed
7-5	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Biodiversity net gain	NKDC notes that the Proposed Development is expected to deliver a significant BNG and that a Biodiversity Gain Plan, oLEMP and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan are required to demonstrate how this would be secured. NKDC considers that further habitat surveys should be undertaken to support the BNG assessment.	The oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] outlines the habitat management and monitoring needed to deliver BNG, including a 13% gain in watercourse units (ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.14: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.3] [REP3-021]). All habitats have been surveyed using UK habitat survey methodology and assessed for priority habitat status (ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3.3] [REP3-019]); therefore, no further surveys are required. Approximately 15km of	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			Both parties agree that the oLEMP and final detailed LEMP will secure delivery of BNG, with commitment to meet the trading rules for hedgerows and document measures in the final plan as secured under Requirement 8 in the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/5.1.3]	new hedgerow planting is proposed (ES Volume 2, Figure 3.3: Green Infrastructure Parameter Plans [EN010149/APP/6.2.4] [REP4-015]), and the final LEMP will ensure the trading rules regards hedgerows are satisfied by creating 0.03km of native hedgerow with trees and enhancing 0.02km of existing native hedgerows to good condition. Both parties agree with the approach to BNG.	Agreed
7-6	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Breeding bird survey reports	<p>Through ongoing engagement and additional information at Deadlines 1 and 2, NKDC is satisfied with the approach to the breeding bird survey report, including survey methodology, additional targeted surveys (e.g., barn owl, quail), and the nature conservation evaluation, which goes beyond the method statement.</p> <p>NKDC and the Applicant agree that the survey methodology, targeted assessments, and evaluation are robust, comprehensive, and meet or exceed standard guidance.</p>	The Applicant confirms that breeding bird surveys followed Bird Survey & Assessment Steering Group (2024) guidelines, adjusted from the older Fuller (1980) methodology, and supplemented with county bird records. Quail and barn owl were specifically addressed through daytime and targeted nest surveys, respectively (ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.2: Breeding Bird Surveys [EN10149/APP/6.3] [APP-083] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Barn Owl Survey – Confidential [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-085]). Mitigation is detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN10149/APP/6.1.3] [REP3-012] and habitat creation/enhancement secured through the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5].	
7-8	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Hedgerows and trees	NKDC is satisfied with the measures taken to avoid impact on hedgerows and trees.	Potential impacts on hedgerows and trees during construction are scoped as temporary, with reinstatement or compensatory planting included.	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			NKDC and the Applicant agree that mitigation and habitat enhancement measures for hedgerows and trees are sufficient to avoid adverse effects and deliver a net gain.	<p>Overall, a net gain in hedgerows is expected during operation. Surveys and assessments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hedgerows Survey – ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.11: Important Hedgerows Survey [EN010149/APP/6.3.2] [REP3-017] - Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Root Protection Plan – ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.12: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-093] - Mitigation measures – ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1.3] [REP3-012], oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] and oCEMP [EN010149/APP/7.7.5] [REP4-025] <p>Approximately 15km of new hedgerow planting is proposed to enhance biodiversity and landscape value.</p>	Agreed
7-9	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Offsets	<p>NKDC note that minimum separation distances to all green features must be informed by a tree survey and constraints plan to consider Root Protection Zones.</p> <p>NKDC and the Applicant agree that Root Protection Zones and buffer distances are appropriately incorporated into the design to safeguard trees and woodland.</p>	<p>Tree survey details and Root Protection Zone plans are presented in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.12: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-093]. Separation distances have been incorporated into the design. Key measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 m buffer from crown to Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) per Natural England and Forestry Commission (2022) guidance. • Design commitments follow BS 5837:2012 for tree protection during design, construction, and operation. 	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
7-10	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Scoping	NKDC is satisfied with the measures taken to avoid impact on hedgerows habitat and secure a gain in hedgerow habitat.	<p>These measures ensure protection of retained trees and woodland throughout the development.</p> <p>Potential effects on habitats and species during construction (e.g. hedgerow loss) have been scoped in specifically for the construction phase as these are anticipated to be temporary. For example, while some hedgerow habitat would be 'lost' during construction, it would be re-instated or replaced by compensation hedgerow planting elsewhere. Overall, there would be a gain in the amount of hedgerow once established during the operational phase. Details of habitat creation and improvement measures are shown in the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] and details of impact assessment and mitigation are provided in ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1.3] [REP3-012].</p>	Agreed
7-11	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Vegetation	NKDC note that proposed vegetation removal should be surveyed to BS5837 to establish its arboriculture value and appropriate mitigation. NKDC note that retained vegetation should also be protected to BS5837.	An arboricultural impact assessment survey was carried out of vegetation within the Site to establish arboriculture value and appropriate mitigation (as per BS5837). This is detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.12: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-093] .	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
7-13	Subsequent Correspondence	Ecological Steering Group	NKDC and the Applicant agree that the oLEMP provides appropriate habitat management and that final details will be developed in consultation with the Ecological Steering Group.	The oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] has been updated to outline how the ecological steering group will be established and how the group will function as part of this Proposed Development.	Agreed
7-14	Subsequent Correspondence	BNG Monitoring	NKDC notes that there is no mechanism set out for funding the monitoring of BNG. Whilst NKDC welcomes the commitment to fund the Ecological Steering Group through the draft s106 Agreement, at present there are no terms of reference for the ESG and the Applicant has confirmed that funding of BNG monitoring would not be within the scope of the Group. The Council's position is that BNG monitoring should be funded (via the ESG if necessary) and this is confirmed in Deadline 5 submissions.	The Applicant does not agree that additional funding is required to enable NKDC to undertake its own specific BNG monitoring over and above what the Applicant (with oversight from the ESG) would undertake. As detailed within the Applicant responded to Written Responses to Deadline 4 Submissions [EN010149/APP/8.28]	Not Agreed

Table 8 – Climate

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
8-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Alternatives	<p>NKDC notes that GHG emissions should consider 'alternatives' in the context of offsets, reflecting revised layouts or energy generation capacity in relation to BMV land. NKDC also recommends comparison against other technologies (e.g., nuclear, onshore/offshore wind), similar to the West Burton Solar Park DCO.</p> <p>NKDC and the Applicant agree that the assessment demonstrates the Proposed Development contributes to the UK's net zero targets and is comparable to other renewable technologies.</p>	<p>The GHG assessment in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP3-008] covers emissions from construction, operation (including maintenance/replacement), and decommissioning, and the anticipated GHG savings from displacing fossil fuel generation, following IEMA guidance. A technical note in Appendix 2 of the Response to Deadline 1 [EN010149/APP/8.20] [REP2-023] compares emissions against alternative baselines and demonstrates that the Proposed Development is comparable to other renewable technologies, contributing to decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid.</p>	Agreed
8-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Carbon sequestration	<p>NKDC acknowledges the information provided in the Response to Deadline 1, including the technical note in Appendix 2 of the Response to Deadline 1 [EN010149/APP/8.20] [REP2-023] and agrees that no further calculation is necessary. NKDC has reviewed the updated oLEMP, noting the inclusion of measures for carbon sequestration within the development area and the enhancement of soil conditions</p>	<p>The expected carbon sequestration potential of new planting would be less than 1% (96,000 tCO₂e) of the change in total emissions and therefore was not considered further.</p> <p>IEMA's Guide to Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance (2022) states: "<i>activities that do not significantly change the result of the assessment can be excluded where expected emissions are less than 1% of total emissions, and where all such exclusions total a</i></p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			through the selection of appropriate planting beneath the panels. NKDC supports these updates and has no further comments.	<p><i>maximum of 5% of total emissions, all exclusions should be clearly stated."</i></p> <p>The Applicant has updated the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] to state that grassland under the Solar PV modules will be managed as legume-rich modified grassland to provide biodiversity benefit and improve soil health. A suggested legume and flower mix is provided in Appendix 4 of the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] based on the successful establishment of similar mixes by the landowner. Should the DCO be granted consent, details of the final species mixes will be submitted for approval by the relevant planning authority with each LEMP(s) and must be substantially in accordance with the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5]. The updated oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] is secured by Requirement 8 of the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5].</p>	Agreed
8-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Payback period	NKDC and the Applicant agree that the ES now provides a transparent methodology and payback calculation for the Proposed Development.	<p>A reasonable worst-case scenario has been adopted considering source countries, manufacturing methods, and transport. The operational emissions payback period is 3 years; lifecycle emissions payback is 10 years. Calculations are based on ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.12] [REP3-008]: operational</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>emissions = 954,474 tCO₂e, lifecycle = 3,004,796 tCO₂e, with 12.7 million tCO₂e displaced over 40 years. Annual GHG savings = 316,266 tCO₂e.</p> <p>Updated calculations clarifying this were provided at Deadline 3, ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.12] [REP3-008],</p>	
8-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Replacement of equipment	<p>Initially raised concern that ES assumptions on replacement of PV modules underestimate emissions; requested further justification. Noted that total lifespan and 0.4% p.a. degradation imply modules may need replacement before 40 years, citing Heckington Fen and West Burton ES for reference.</p> <p>NKDC now accepts that the ES assumptions sufficiently cover PV module replacement and construction breakage within a conservative worst-case scenario.</p> <p>NKDC also notes the Examining Authority's schedule of proposed changes to the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). Issued on 2 September 2025, which would limit panel replacement to 5% of the overall total.</p>	<p>A reasonable worst-case scenario has been adopted, including equipment replacement. PV module replacement assumptions are covered in Table 8.5, ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.12] [REP3-008]. Modern PV modules have warranties up to 40 years with 0.3% degradation. Replacement over the lifetime is expected to be 0.5%, with 0.2% construction breakage. Conservative assumptions of 5% total account for both replacement and breakage. Other components' construction wastage: PV frames/foundations/switchgear = 1%, inverters = 5%. ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP3-008], updated at Deadline 3, clarifies these assumptions.</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
8-5	ExQ1 Response	Assessment Methodology	NKDC is content with the methodology proposed and assumptions in the appendix 8.1.	ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Raw Data and Emissions Factors [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-096] presents the raw data and emissions factors used to carry out the greenhouse gas assessment. This appendix is intended to be read in conjunction with the wider ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP3-008] , which includes the methodology and assumptions used within the assessment.	Agreed
8-6	ExQ1 Response	Baseline for Assessment Comparisons	NKDC has provided a statement as part of the ISH3 Oral Submissions Summary submitted at Deadline 3: "The Council notes that the Technical Note on Climate Change now includes, at Table 2, a comparison of the proposed development with a range of other technologies which the Council considers acceptable."	<p>ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP3-008] in Paragraph 8.7.17 contains justification for using comparison of the Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) power plant as a method to determine the emissions savings of the Proposed Development. It makes reference to the Secretary of State's decision letter for Gate Burton Energy Park (July 2024), a scheme that was consented despite the Secretary of State's comments.</p> <p>A technical note which provides an assessment of the GHG emissions against several alternative baselines has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 2 of the Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-023]. The findings of these different methodologies showcase that the Proposed Development is comparable with other renewable energy technologies and contributes to the</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				decarbonisation of the UK's electricity grid. These findings further support the conclusion in ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.12] [REP3-008] that the Proposed Development contributes to the UK's transition to net zero and aids in reducing GHG emissions within the energy sector.	

Table 9 – Connecting to the Grid

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
9-1	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Grid Connection to proposed National Grid Navenby Substation	<p>NKDC note that any delay in a grid connection would reduce the potential benefits of the solar farm providing renewable energy before the government's target date of 2030 and therefore may impact the planning balance.</p> <p>During the Examination, the Council will seek to ensure that an additional Requirement is provided to restrict the commencement of the Springwell solar farm until the NGNS has reached a meaningful point of construction that gives certainty to the provision of the</p>	<p>Detail of the Proposed Development's grid connection can be found in the Grid Connection Statement [EN010149/APP/7.6.2] [REP1-058]. The grid connection is also visible on the 'TEC Register' which is found on National Energy System Operator (NESO) website.</p> <p>Should the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation be delayed, NESO would be required to offer new connection dates to the Applicant. This would likely lead to a delay in the Proposed Development being constructed and commissioned. If the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation did not proceed, the Applicant would expect a revised grid connection to be</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>substation within the anticipated timescale and to ensure alignment between the projects.</p> <p>NKDC interpret the comments that Springwell will still proceed if the NGNS does not happen, however, how it will be achieved is not clear as the proposed site has been justified through the site selection principles based on the location of the substation providing the grid connection. An alternative grid connection location could potentially necessitate a different location for the BESS, Springwell substation and grid corridor which will have different environmental impacts.</p> <p>It is noted that no alternative connection point has been identified through the course of pre-application discussions. It is the Council's understanding that no alternative exists ergo that the application is predicated solely/exclusively on the NGNS as its connection point.</p> <p>The ability to provide renewable energy in line with the aspirations of the Clean Power Action Plan 2030 connection</p>	<p>offered at an alternative point of connection into the NETS.</p> <p>The Applicant's preferred scenario is to connect at the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation, at the earliest date possible, to supply the grid with renewable energy and help towards the UK's goal of 70GW of operational solar by 2035. The Statement of Need [EN010149/APP/7.1] [APP-0135] provides evidence on the urgent need for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Finally, the Applicant's decision to commence construction of the Proposed Development would also be driven by commercial considerations, and it is highly unlikely that the Applicant would construct the Proposed Development without sufficient confidence that a grid connection would be in place for the export of the energy generated.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out their position on Grid Connection Date and Commencement, in response to NKDC's LIR, in Table 2-2 of Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [EN010149/APP/8.20] [REP2-023].</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>would lend additional weight to the proposals in the planning balance than if the production of renewable energy was delayed until after this date.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.7-11.8 and 11.11-11.12 of NKDC's Local Impact Report [REP1-102] set out the council position on grid connection to Navenby Substation.</p>		

Table 10 - Construction

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
10-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Working hours	<p>NKDC requests for revision of proposed working hours, including no work on weekends or public holidays where residents could be disturbed.</p> <p>NKDC's recommended proposed working hours are:</p> <p>Construction working hours on site should be from 7am to 6pm Monday through to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays with no noisy construction work on Sundays or Public Holidays.</p>	<p>Construction working hours on site would be from 7am to 7pm Monday through Friday and 7am to 12 noon on Saturday. No working would be permitted on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</p> <p>A variety of Best Practical Means are proposed to limit impacts to the local community during the construction phase (as set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-062] and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-</p>	Not Agreed

In their response to EXQ2.15.2, set out in the **Responses to ExQ2, the ExA's suggested changes to the draft DCO and comments on Deadline 3 submissions** [\[REP4-053\]](#), the Council advises the proposed hours for all construction works within the District. This mitigates against noise outside hours which are considered as sensitive as per the World Health Organisation (Night Noise Guidelines for Europe). The Council acknowledges that other consented Lincolnshire solar schemes have not adopted the same hours, however, as they are located in different local authority areas, they may have different local working hours.

[015\]](#)). This includes the use of temporary hoarding around construction works close to nearby properties.

Construction impacts have been assessed and are detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration** [\[EN010149/APP/6.1\]](#) [\[APP-052\]](#). Impacts are anticipated, primarily during the trenching works between Springwell Central and Springwell West however, these are considered to be of short duration and not significant.

Table 11 – Cultural Heritage

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
11-1	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Adequacy of assessment (Above ground)	NKDC noted in their Relevant Representation and subsequent correspondence the lack of detailed analysis of individual assets and limited information as why individual heritage	The Applicant considers that the ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk- Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] ,	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
		heritage assets)	assets were scoped out. During the Examination the Applicant continued to engage with NKDC and updated the baseline documents to include additional commentary on the buildings with the greatest potential impact.	<p>which follows published guidance from LCC and Historic England and refers to the ZTV for the Proposed Development, adequately identifies those heritage assets with potential for likely significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engage with NKDC through the examination and has provided additional explanatory text regarding the scoping out of receptors within updates to ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk- Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] submitted at Deadline 4, and is supported by the NKDC. The assessment provided within Appendix 9.1 submitted for Deadline 4 contains sufficient information to form a balanced judgement of the harm to the significance of heritage assets and the likely significant effects. No additional significant effects have been identified as a result of the amendments to ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk- Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019].</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
11-2a	Relevant Representation, S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Setting of above ground heritage assets – Scopwick Mill, Kirkby Green Mill, Ashby Hall and Ashby Walled Garden, Farmyard North of The Firs, Blankney St Oswald's Church	NKDC agree with the conclusions of the assessment in Annex 14 of ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] regarding the magnitude of impact, level of less than substantial harm and significance of effect on these designated heritage assets.	ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] concludes that there will be no significant adverse effects to any designated heritage assets.	Agreed
11-2b	Subsequent Correspondence and meetings	Setting of heritage assets – Brauncewell medieval village and Church of All Saints	Agreed with the setting assessment for Brauncewell medieval village (Scheduled Monument 1018397) and the Grade II listed Church of All Saints (LBEN 1254135).	Brauncewell medieval village is assessed in the ES, which concluded there would be a slight impact on the significance of the Scheduled Monument due to visibility of the Proposed Development within its wider rural setting. There would also be a beneficial impact from the proposed permissive path. All Saints Church (LBEN 1254135), the surviving parish church for Brauncewell village, is experienced surrounded by the earthworks of the former village and a later farmhouse. The closest solar arrays would be over 500 m to the north. The church will continue to be experienced in association with the remains of the medieval village and later farmstead. The change to the	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				wider rural surroundings from the solar farm would result in a slight impact to the church's significance (less than substantial harm), which is not significant, and the asset was therefore scoped out of the ES.	
11-2c	Subsequent Correspondence and meetings	Setting of heritage assets – Dunsby medieval village Scheduled Monument	Agreed with the setting assessment carried out for Dunsby medieval village (Scheduled Monument 1018395).	Dunsby medieval village derives its significance and principal reason for designation as a Scheduled Monument from its archaeological interest, as the buried remains provide evidence of the settlement's occupation. The remains are experienced within farmland, and although the medieval field systems have been altered, the rural setting contributes to the monument's significance as an abandoned settlement. The Proposed Development would be over 1 km to the north, and the ZTV predicts no visibility from the monument. LVIA visualisation 27 shows a view from further north overlooking land likely farmed from Dunsby towards the Proposed Development. The change to the wider rural surroundings will not impact the archaeological interest of the monument, and it was therefore scoped out of the ES.	Agreed
11-2d	Relevant Representation, S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Above ground heritage assets – Thompson's Bottom Farmhouse, Coach house	Paragraphs 16.11-16.16 of NKDC's Local Impact Report [REP1-102] and ISH2 Oral Submissions at deadline 3 set out the Council's relevant position on Thompson's Bottom Farmhouse. NKDC consider that the level of harm to the significance of the buildings at	The assessment contained within Annex 14 of ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] concludes that the Proposed Development will result in harm to the significance of these assets through changes to their setting. Specifically, the	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
	and Subsequent Correspondence	and stables at Thompson's Bottom Farm	Thompson's Bottom Farm would be greater than the Applicant concludes and would result in a significant effect.	enclosure of currently open views of farmland from Warren Lane to the east of the listed buildings. The assessment concludes that the harm to the buildings' significance as a result of changes in their setting brought about by the Proposed Development would be at the lower end of less than substantial, this harm would not result in a significant effect but as a Grade II Listed Building any harm to its significance should be weighed against the benefits of the Proposed Development and this asset is included in the Harm Statement (Appendix 5 of the Planning Statement) submitted at Deadline 4 [EN010149/APP/7.2.3] [REP4-023] .	
11-2e	Subsequent Correspondence	Setting of heritage assets – Temple Bruer	Agreed with the setting assessment carried out for Temple Farmhouse, Temple Bruer Knights Templar Preceptory (Scheduled Monument 1007686), and the Grade I Church Tower north of Temple Farmhouse (LBEN 1261359).	<p>Temple Farmhouse (LBEN 1254328/1261359) is a 17th century farmhouse with later alterations, associated with the remains of the 13th century church tower, part of the Knights Templar Preceptory (SM 1007686). The farmhouse's significance derives from its architecture, historical association with the preceptory, and surviving medieval fabric. The tower's significance derives from its architecture, historical and associative value, and archaeological interest.</p> <p>The nearest solar arrays are over 1 km to the east. ZTV (ES Figure 10.5a) shows no visibility from the farmhouse due to a ridge; LVIA Viewpoint 32 shows limited visibility east of the ridge. The impact on the farmhouse is assessed as slight (less than substantial</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>harm) and on the tower as negligible; neither is significant. These assets were scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>Updates to ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk- Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] submitted for Deadline 4 in response to representations from an Interested Party do not alter the conclusions of the assessment.</p>	
11-2f	Subsequent Correspondence	Setting of heritage assets –	Agreed with the setting assessment carried out for Home Farmhouse (LBEN 1061825)	Home Farmhouse (LBEN 1061825) is an early 18th century farmhouse with later alterations, significant for its architectural and historic interest. It is experienced within its garden and enclosed yard, with wider agricultural land largely screened by buildings and mature trees. Proposed highways works are ~200m west and will not affect its setting. The nearest solar arrays are ~1 km west, further screened by vegetation. ZTV (ES Figures 10.5a and 10.5b) shows limited visibility; LVIA Viewpoints 21 and 22 confirm the solar farm would be a distant, softened feature. The impact on significance is slight (less than substantial harm) and not significant. This asset was scoped out of the ES.	Agreed
11-3	Relevant Representation, S42 Consultation response to	Non-Designated Heritage Assets	NKDC notes that ES Chapter 9 does not consider their Local List of non-designated heritage assets which is required to demonstrate a full	No significant effects are predicted to the non-designated heritage assets due to their relative importance and these have been considered in the ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
	2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence		<p>understanding of the built environment of the area around the site.</p> <p>Paragraphs 16.11-16.16 of NKDC's Local Impact Report [REP1-102] sets out the council's relevant position on above ground heritage assets.</p> <p>An assessment of the effects on the collective value of the non-listed farmsteads contained on the Local List is presented in Annex 14 of ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] using a methodology developed by the Applicant and LCC. NKDC defer to LCC on this matter.</p>	<p>Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019]. The collective value of the non-designated farmsteads has been assessed within Annex 14 of ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] using a methodology developed by the Applicant and supported by LCC.</p>	Agreed
11-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to assessment	NKDC note that the term 'ground disturbance' has not been defined.	<p>In the context of ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [AS-012], "ground disturbance" refers to those construction activities that result in topsoil stripping, earthworks or excavation. The piles for the solar arrays would also result in ground disturbance, however as this comprises disturbance over less than 0.1% of the total area of the Proposed Development this is considered to be a negligible</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				amount. Further consideration of known and potential archaeological remains within the Site is set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [AS-012] refers more specifically to the various construction activities impacts on the known and potential archaeological remains within the Site.	
11- 5	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Conservation areas	NKDC is satisfied that the approach, buffer zones, and design mitigation appropriately preserve the significance of the conservation areas and associated listed buildings.	<p>Buffer zones were defined through site visits and analysis of key views. The ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-019] considered all listed buildings in line with Historic England guidance.</p> <p>For Blankney, views of St Oswald's Church from the Spires and Steeples Trail were identified as sensitive, and solar PV was excluded from the field west of the trail to maintain this view. For Scopwick, vegetation limits views in and out of the conservation area; no significant impacts were predicted.</p>	Agreed
11-6	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Scheduled remains	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with the approach to scheduled remains.	<p>The scheduled remains at Brauncewell have been scoped in as they are partly within the Order Limits and a permissive path is proposed across them.</p> <p>The scheduled remains at Dunsby are scoped out as they lie over 1km from the Order Limits and no visibility</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				is predicted by the ZTV. Therefore, no effects will occur to this asset.	
11-7	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Further assessments	NKDC notes that the assessments will require updating and additional surveys to reflect the area of the Proposed Development including the area of the Grid Connection Corridor.	The ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk- Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] has been updated to reflect the additional area for the Grid Connection Corridor and revised ZTV. Additional geophysical surveys have been carried out, which are detailed in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-100] - [APP-105] . It is not considered that the geoarchaeological deposit model (see ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.2: Geoarchaeological Deposit Modelling Report [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-098]) requires updating to include the Grid Connection Corridor as the transects examined in the model provide sufficient information to address the queries raised by Historic England and the local authority archaeological advisors in response to the geophysical survey results, which is supported by NKDC.	Agreed
11-8	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Green Infrastructure	NKDC note that Green Infrastructure and areas for mitigation, enhancement and/or retained agricultural land could have potential impacts on surviving archaeology e.g. mitigation measures such as scrapes, wildlife ponds and tree planting, but there is no indication that	No scrapes or ponds are proposed. Tree planting would be limited to hedgerow enhancements and a proposed community growing area north of Scopwick. Further trenching as part of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI) [EN010149/APP/7.15.3] [REP4-038] would inform the detailed design, including the nature of planting for the community growing area in	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>this has been considered or would be evaluated on mitigated.</p> <p>Refer to Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) LIR [REP1-088] and WR [AS-022].</p>	<p>order to minimise impacts on below ground archaeological remains. The oWSI [EN010149/APP/7.15.3] [REP4-038] includes provision for amendments to the scope of evaluation work should changes to the ecological mitigation. Both parties agree that green Infrastructure and areas for mitigation, enhancement and/or retained agricultural land would not have potential impacts on surviving archaeology,</p>	
11-9	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Planning policy	<p>NKDC note that relevant planning policy should include the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan including Appendix E 'Non designated Heritage Assets'.</p> <p>The Council's LIR sets out the relevant national and local planning policies. CLLP policies are summarised in Table 8.1. In respect of landscape and visual impact, the relevant Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan (SKNP) policies are set out in paragraph 17.7-17.8 within NKDC LIR.</p>	<p>Appendix 3: Policy Compliance Assessment Table of the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] provides a comprehensive assessment of the Proposed Development's compliance against each relevant national and local planning policy. Including both the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan in table 6 and Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan in table 7, should be read in conjunction with the assessment section of the Planning Statement. Including Policy 10 Protecting Heritage Assets, concludes there would be no significant adverse impacts to any designated or non-designated heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development once embedded and additional mitigation measures are implemented.</p> <p>The list of non-designated heritage assets provided in Appendix E of the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan has been considered within the ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019]. No significant effects are predicted for these non-designated assets.</p> <p>An assessment of landscape effects is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] and Appendix 10.2: Baseline Landscape Character Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-108], including historic character of the County of Lincolnshire. It concludes that there will be no significant adverse impacts to any designated heritage assets, including Listed Buildings or Historic Landscape Character, as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk- Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3.5] [REP4-017] and [REP4-019] was updated at Deadline 4 to include an assessment of the group value of non-designated farmhouses, the methodology for which was developed in consultation with LCC.</p>	Agreed
11-10	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Views from RAF Digby (a non-designated	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with the approach taken in the	Views from RAF Digby have informed the proposed layout. As noted in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] , no above ground structures are proposed within immediately adjoining fields or within approximately	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
	and Subsequent Correspondence	heritage asset, MLI60621)	ES regards the assessment of above ground individual assets.	1km of the main residential barracks in RAF Digby. A gentle ridge to the east of the B1191 (Heath Road) together with established woodland separates the residential barracks from Springwell Central. No significant effects are predicted to this non-designated heritage asset or the designated heritage assets within RAF Digby.	Agreed
11-11	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Archaeology - Adequacy of trial trenching	NKDC, LCC, and the Applicant agree that the archaeological investigations are robust, that mitigation is appropriately secured, and that sufficient information has been provided to inform the Application.	<p>Agreement was reached with local archaeological advisors on the methodology for trial trenching, which was undertaken per the approved Written Scheme of Investigation and reported in ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.5: Archaeological Trial Trenching Report [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-106]. Trenching confirmed strong correlation with desk-based and geophysical surveys, indicating limited potential for unknown remains beyond those already identified.</p> <p>Further archaeological work is secured by a DCO Requirement, with mitigation measures detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [AS-012] and the oCEMP [EN010149/APP/7.7.5] [REP4-025], preventing unnecessary destruction of assets and informing final design and cable routing.</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
11-12	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Archaeological Potential – Approach to assessment	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with LCC and the Applicant. Refer to Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) LIR [REP1-088] and WR [AS-022] .	The Applicant and NKDC agree that the consideration of extensive archaeological trial trenching pre-determination, where the geophysical survey results provide clear information on the below-ground archaeological potential, is disproportionate to the impacts of the Proposed Development.	Agreed
11-13	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Archaeology – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with LCC and the Applicant. Refer to Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) LIR [REP1-088] and WR [AS-022] .	The Applicant has submitted an oWSI [EN010149/APP/7.15.3] [REP4-038] with the application noting that post-consent authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the document. The oWSI [EN010149/APP/7.15.3] [REP4-038] sets out the processes by which the various authorities will be involved in the development of the detailed archaeological mitigation measures.	Agreed
11-14	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Archaeology – Requirement 11	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with LCC and the Applicant. Refer to Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) LIR [REP1-088] and WR [AS-022] .	Mallard Pass included a requirement (6) for detailed design approval which required that “ <i>details... demonstrate how they have taken account of the results of any archaeological investigations or archaeological evaluations carried out pursuant to the outline written scheme of investigation</i> ” it is agreed that this would be an appropriate insertion to suggested DCO Requirement 5 of the Proposed Development.	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				The wording of DCO Requirement 11 has been agreed with NKDC, LCC and Historic England and is set out in the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5] .	

Table 12 – Cumulative Effects

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
12-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to assessment	NKDC request that two live planning applications for TCPA 1990 solar development referenced 23/1419/FUL (Mareham Lane Scredington) and 23/1021/FUL (land at Little Hale Fen) are included within the short-list of existing development.	<p>Mareham Lane (23/1419/FUL) has been included in the short-list of cumulative developments as it met the criteria for inclusion. An assessment of inter-project cumulative effects is included within ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013].</p> <p>Little Hale Fen (23/1021/FUL) has not been assessed as it does not meet the short-list criteria outlined in ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013]. The development is located approximately 12km from the Proposed Development and is outside the Zone of Influence of 10km that has informed the short-list of other existing development and/or approved developments that have been assessed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013].</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
12-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Approach to assessment	<p>NKDC are in agreement with general commentary in relation to cumulative effects of the Proposed Development in combination with Fosse Green, Heckington Fen and Beacon Fen and that these are scoped into assessment.</p> <p>NKDC also request that the long and short lists of other existing developments should be kept under review.</p> <p>The applicant should include the Leoda solar farm NSIP as well as the Green Man Road and Coleby BESS applications.</p>	<p>An assessment of inter-project cumulative effects with other existing development and/or approved developments, which includes the Fosse Green Solar Farm, Heckington Fen and Beacon Fen is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013].</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the Cumulative Assessment at Deadline 1 to consider the Leoda Solar Farm. The cumulative assessment has also been updated in full at Deadline 2 and 3 to consider all other relevant developments that fall into the short list.</p>	Agreed
12-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Biodiversity	<p>NKDC requested further consideration of cumulative habitat change, particularly in relation to other solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire, and highlighted the need to understand potential impacts on ground-nesting birds at the landscape scale. NKDC agreed that mitigation measures should be designed to minimise</p>	<p>NKDC and the Applicant agree that the proposed mitigation will minimise adverse effects on ground-nesting birds and address potential cumulative impacts with other nearby developments.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed long-term cumulative impacts of habitat change on ground-nesting birds and incorporated extensive habitat creation (100+ ha grassland, 15,563 m new hedgerow, 16 ha tree belts) and enhancement measures (field margins, tussocky grassland, herbal ley). These will improve nesting and foraging opportunities over the operational life of</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			cumulative impacts and that this should be clearly set out in the ES.	<p>the project. Construction impacts on ground-nesting birds are temporary and not significant.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are detailed in the oLEMP [EN10149/APP/7.9.5] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.13] [REP3-012]. Cumulative effects with other developments have been considered in ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013].</p>	
12-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Land, soil and groundwater	<p>NKDC are in agreement with the Applicant's commitment to review the cumulative availability of BMV land in the region in agreement with statutory consultees.</p> <p>NKDC suggest that all registered solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire should be considered in relation to cumulative assessment on agricultural land.</p> <p>As set out in their Responses to ExQ1 [REP-103], NKDC states that the BMV figures are not necessarily recognised by Natural England or DEFRA, but NKDC agree that if verified or confirmed they would be correct.</p>	<p>The Applicant is grateful for engagement with NKDC and LCC on this matter, and the approach to land, soil and groundwater in the cumulative assessment is now agreed.</p> <p>An assessment of the temporary loss of BMV agricultural land from solar developments in Lincolnshire and within 1km of the Nottinghamshire boundary has been undertaken, as detailed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013].</p> <p>This matter is addressed in Table 3-9 – Land, Soil and Groundwater in the Response to Relevant Representations [EN101049/APP/8.13] [REP1-070].</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
12-5	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	National Grid Navenby Substation (NGNS)	<p>NKDC does not agree with the Applicant's conclusion that cumulative effects are not significant. NKDC considers that the ES underestimates cumulative impacts, particularly in relation to construction disruption, BMV land loss, and community amenity in relation to the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development and NGNS.</p> <p>NKDC maintains that the cumulative assessment should fully account for the effects of the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation (NGNS) and other solar NSIPs (Fosse Green, Leoda, Beacon Fen). NKDC considers that cumulative impacts could be significant, particularly on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction traffic and transport - Construction and operational noise and vibration - Agricultural land loss (BMV) - Landscape and visual amenity 	<p>The Applicant has assessed cumulative effects with the NGNS and other projects in ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013]. The assessment finds no significant cumulative effects, except for significant adverse cumulative residual effects on landscape and visual amenity in specific areas if NGNS and the Proposed Development were constructed concurrently. No significant cumulative residential visual effects are expected.</p> <p>Noise, agricultural land, biodiversity, and GHG emissions have been considered, with no significant inter-project cumulative effects anticipated. GHG emissions relating to NGNS are addressed in paragraph 16.6.6-16.6.10 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013].</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity (including permanent changes) - GHG emissions (proportional to grid connection capacity) <p>NKDC concludes that these cumulative impacts may negatively affect local amenity and require further assessment.</p>		

Table 14 – Design

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
14-1	Email and Meeting Correspondence, and Subsequent Correspondence	Approach to good design	NKDC agrees with the Applicant's approach to good design and confirms it was consulted throughout the engagement process. This includes the application of design principles to guide decision-making and embed good design outcomes for the Proposed Development, which will be secured via Control	The Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028] sets out the Applicant's approach to good design, demonstrating how the Proposed Development fulfils the requirements of EN-1 and EN-3, following the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, reduce, mitigate, compensate). Good design has been embedded from the outset through a clear design framework and application of design principles, providing a shared understanding of desired outcomes and informing decision-making.	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			Documents within the draft DCO.	The document explains how the design has evolved, the rationale for the proposals in the DCO Application, and how good design will be secured post-consent. The approach was discussed with NKDC at key engagement meetings, including presentations of the design approach, Project Principles, and securing mechanisms (01/06/23, 14/09/23, and 12/09/24).	Agreed
14-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Design principles	<p>NKDC support for the principle of removing fields, or parts of fields, from development where they comprise wholly or partially BMV land.</p> <p>These comments are without prejudice to the Council's position on LVIA and heritage impacts as stated elsewhere in the SOCG.</p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been guided by the Project Principles set out with the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028]. This includes retaining all fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the Site as available for arable production (Principle 8.1); prioritising the use of BMV land for arable production where practicable (Principle 8.2); and prioritising the use on non-BMV land for habitat creation where practicable (Principle 8.3).</p> <p>A summary of how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved to respond to each of these Project Principles is provided in the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028].</p>	
14-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Design principles	<p>NKDC supports the principle of removing fields, or parts of fields, from development to reduce impacts on the Spires and Steeples Way.</p>	The design of the Proposed Development has been guided by the Project Principles in the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028] , including protecting the amenity of the Spires and Steeples Trail (Principle 5.2). Solar PV development has been removed	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			These comments are without prejudice to the Council's position on LVIA and heritage impacts, as set out elsewhere in the SOCG.	<p>from adjoining fields west of the footpath (Fields C7, Md03, Md04, Md05) and north of Scopwick (Field Md02), leaving only a short stretch (~250m in Fields C6, C8, C9) adjacent to the route. This minimises potential visual effects and ensures no interruption of views to Blankney or Scopwick churches. These extents are secured on the Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3] [APP-007].</p> <p>Where PV development is adjacent to the footpath, mitigation includes offsetting perimeter fencing by at least 15m from all PRow, with a larger offset at the northwest corner of Field C6, as secured in the Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4.2] [REP3-030].</p>	
14-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Embedded mitigation measures	NKDC request for the Applicant to clarify whether proposed buffer zones are derived from guidance, good practice, precedence from other solar NSIPs, professional judgement or a combination.	<p>The identification of all buffer zones is derived from a combination of guidance, good practice, precedence set by other NSIP solar schemes and professional judgement from technical specialists of the project team.</p> <p>For example, there would be a minimum 15m offset from the proposed built development to any existing woodland in accordance with guidance published by Natural England and the British Standards Institution for tree root protection areas.</p>	Agreed
14-5	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and	Enhancements	NKDC supports the development of Green Infrastructure /proposals for recreation and amenity improvements, which should be	The Applicant is committed to continuing to engage proactively with stakeholders in the design of Green Infrastructure and amenity and recreation improvements as part of the Proposed Development	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
	Subsequent Correspondence		<p>maximised and integrated within the Proposed Development</p> <p>Agreed without prejudice to NKDC's comments on maximising provision of BNG.</p>	Details of the proposed enhancements to the green infrastructure network are presented in the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028] and include the provision of 3.49km of new PRoW, 8.58km of permissive paths, improvements to the Spires and Steeples Trail and a new community growing area.	

Table 15 – Glint and Glare

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
15-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Glint and glare impacts on the A15	<p>NKDC agree that glint and glare impacts have now been resolved on the A15 users and properties through mitigation.</p> <p>No issues regarding glint and glare have been raised in NKDC's LIR.</p>	<p>Potential glint and glare effects towards the A15 and dwellings within the assessment area have been resolved through the development of the design and implementation of landscape planting.</p> <p>Screening in the form of existing and proposed vegetation, buildings and/or intervening terrain is predicted to significantly obstruct views of reflecting panels, such that solar reflections would not be experienced. For a small location on the A15, a temporary screen would be implemented to allow proposed vegetation to reach a sufficient height and density to mitigate impacts.</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
15-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Mitigation	<p>NKDC agrees that landscaping should not be relied upon to mitigate identified glint and glare effects, as it would require time to mature.</p> <p>As set out in paragraphs 17.34 – 17.36 of their LIR, NKDC sets out their position on LVIA mitigation and new planting.</p>	<p>The assessment has concluded that for 99 dwellings, no impact is predicted. For four dwellings, a low impact is predicted because of marginal views and the duration of effects. This is not considered significant, and no further mitigation is required. Further detail on the assessment is provided in ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3.2] [REP1-028].</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that new planting would take time to mature and has committed to advanced planting (prior to installation of solar panels) as part of the Proposed Development. No significant impact is predicated upon the residential amenity of dwellings during the interim of proposed vegetation growing to a suitable height and density due to relevant mitigating factors. For road safety, temporary measures to mitigate impacts during the interim have been identified. This would include planting adjacent to the A15 for a 700m section of this road to mitigate potential glint and glare effects upon road users.</p> <p>Until the advance planting (to be planted in Winter 2024/25) in this area has grown to sufficient density and height of 3m to mitigate impacts of glint and glare, temporary mitigation will be implemented to mitigate impacts. This temporary mitigation may include temporary screening or suitable alternative mitigation to be confirmed in the detailed LEMP. This would be removed once the hedgerows are of sufficient height. It is anticipated that a temporary barrier or suitable alternative would be required</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>for approximately 3 years following the construction phase. The landscape planting proposals are secured within the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5]. The full green infrastructure has been considered within the glint and glare assessment (see ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3.2] [REP1-028]).</p> <p>In regards to paragraphs 17.34-17.36 of the council's LIR, The Applicant has set out their position on LVIA Mitigation, including above ground heritage assets, in response to NKDC's LIR, in Table 2-7 of Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [EN010149/APP/8.20] [REP2-023].</p>	

Table 16 – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
16-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	A15	At statutory consultation, NKDC suggested that the A15 should be reclassified from having 'low' susceptibility and 'community' value due to its open views from a high number of receptors and regional usage.	<p>The 'susceptibility' and 'value' of the A15 was reevaluated in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050].</p> <p>Susceptibility has been reclassified from 'low' to 'medium/low' and the overall sensitivity of the receptor has been reclassified from 'low' to 'medium/low'. Further justification for these judgements is set out in the above chapter.</p>	Agreed
16-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Application of Rochdale Envelope	<p>At statutory consultation, NKDC stated it was in agreement that the Rochdale Envelope could be applied to the PV panels, though there is concern about its application to larger elements of the Proposed Development due to the likely greater visual effects which depend on the final location and layout of these elements.</p> <p>NKDC requested that the location and 'worst case' extent of these elements are explicitly identified through works plans and/or parameter plans to allow for a better understanding of the potential landscape and visual effects, and ZTV figures produced on the worst-case parameters.</p>	<p>The approach to assessment is set out in ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-045].</p> <p>As explained fully in the above referenced chapter of the ES, it is necessary to maintain a degree of flexibility in the layout of the BESS and Springwell Substation. The Rochdale Envelope approach ensures that the reasonable 'worst-case scenario' has been assessed in the ES.</p> <p>Following Phase Two Consultation, the proposed locations of the BESS and Springwell Substation were each narrowed down to a single location. Therefore, the Application has provided greater certainty regarding the proposed location of these elements. Greater clarity has been provided in</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
16-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to assessment	NKDC are in agreement that the baseline assessment should include both Landscape fabric/ elements; and Landscape key characteristics and that this information should be clearly presented in the LVIA.	<p>relation to the reasonable 'worst-case scenarios' assessed for landscape and visual effects in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050]. The parameters assessed (which represent the maximum parameters of development and therefore a 'worst-case scenario') are described in ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-022]. Of particular relevance is also ES Volume 2: Figure 3.2 Height Parameters [EN010149/APP/6.2.4] [REP4-015]. The ZTVs presented in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Figures [EN010149/APP/6.2] [APP-066] are also based on the maximum parameters identified for each component of the Proposed Development and therefore represent worst-case scenarios for each component.</p>	Agreed
				<p>This has been noted. A full baseline is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.2: Baseline Landscape Character Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-108].</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
16-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence and Post Hearing Submissions at DL3 [REP3-080]	Effects on landscape character at a NCA scale of Springwell Solar Farm alone	<p>At statutory consultation, NKDC noted that the Proposed Development would lead to significant adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity at all phases of the Proposed Development and had the potential to transform the local landscape and its character on a large-scale, with the potential to affect the wider landscape character by replacing large areas of agricultural/rural land with solar development, which would affect the current open agricultural character.</p> <p>The NKDC LIR states at paragraph 17.21 'The development has the potential to transform the local landscape by altering its character on a large scale. This landscape change also has the potential to affect a wider landscape character, at a regional scale'</p> <p>Post hearings submissions at DL3 clarified NKDC's position in relation to the effects on landscape character at a regional scale of Springwell Solar Farm alone (ie on a solus basis). NKDC confirmed that 'At a larger character scale, while the scheme will undoubtedly alter the land use of a large area, the effect will diminish to that at a local level and is unlikely to be significant.'</p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been developed to respond to the distinctive and unique local character of the Site, informed by relevant local studies such as the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment. This is set out in the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028] and is one of the Project Principles (Principle 2.2) which has been used to guide the design.</p> <p>Effects on landscape character and visual amenity are assessed in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050]. Table 10.3 of this chapter, acknowledges that there would be some significant adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity during all phases of the Proposed Development but also reports that for many receptors the effects would reduce over the operational lifetime of the development as a result of the maturation of mitigation planting. The geographical extent and duration of adverse significant effects is set out in the chapter.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that effects on landscape character at the regional level (National Character Area 47 and Landscape Character Type: Central Plateau) would not be significant.</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			See Ref 16-14 for NKDC's position in relation to cumulative effects at a regional scale.	See Ref 16-14 for the Applicant's position in relation to cumulative effects at a regional scale.	
16-5	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Landscape character areas	<p>At statutory consultation, NKDC noted that the size of a character area should not be a determining factor in assessing effects, and caution should be applied in regard to larger LCAs, which can be assessed as having a limited magnitude of change as the Proposed Development would only affect a small percentage of the overall larger character area.</p> <p>NKDC request that the LVIA includes a finer-grained local character assessment which identifies individual elements or features of LCAs to form part of the baseline within the site boundary (LCA 7 and LCA 11) and assesses the change in that part of the LCA resulting from the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>An assessment of landscape effects is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050]. Whilst the effects are reported with reference to LCAs, the size of the LCA is not a factor in determining the significance of the effect. The extent of significant effects on landscape character are defined with reference to physical features in the landscape and not the LCA as a whole.</p> <p>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] provides a finer grain of description of landscape character.</p>	Agreed
16-6	ExQ1	RVAA	<p>NKDC agrees with the methodology and conclusions of the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) in ES Ch. 10 and Appendix 10.5 [APP-111], noting alignment with Landscape Institute TGN 2/19.</p> <p>- NKDC is satisfied with the study area justification and agrees significant effects</p>	Applicant confirms that RVAA considered each property individually with tailored buffers and mitigation, concluding no overbearing visual impact would occur. Comparisons with other projects are not appropriate due to site-specific design.	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>identified do not reach the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold (RVAT).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledges design evolution has increased setbacks from residential properties. - Now satisfied with the decision not to undertake a full assessment for Scopwick, Kirkby Green, Blankney, Ashby de la Launde and RAF Digby barracks, as LVIA shows limited intervisibility. 		
16-7	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Screening	<p>NKDC raised concerns that screening along footpaths need to be considered, including that hedgerows could be overbearing if maintained at 3.5m and that concerns set out in NPS EN-3 that screening could impact on ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>NKDC's response to EXQ1 [REP1-103] stated 'while we agree that hedgerow planting is aligned with the enhancement opportunities identified in the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment for both LCA 7 (Limestone Heath) and LCA 11 (Central Clays and Gravels), and we accept that hedgerow planting can be an effective way to screen and integrate development proposals while adding valuable assets in both landscape and ecological terms; this needs to be</p>	<p>The effect of mitigation planting on existing views has been taken into account in the LVIA presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050]. The approach to mitigation alongside PRoW is set out in the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028].</p> <p>Perimeter fencing surrounding the Solar PV development would be offset by at least 15m from either side of existing and proposed PRoW. Even allowing for growth, any hedgerows adjacent to perimeter fencing would maintain a wide pedestrian corridor, enabling the continued ability to enjoy the route even where views from it would be altered. The LVIA presented in ES Volume 1,</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			carried out in a way that is sensitive to the existing landscape, and not simply to screen views of the proposals. New hedgerow planting can screen or block currently open views, such as along the A15, foreshortening the view and altering both the character and visual experience from receptors.'	<p>Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] acknowledges that in some locations new planting would foreshorten existing views but the alternative would be views of the new infrastructure which would have the same effect in any case.</p> <p>Feedback from Phase Two Consultation indicated a strong preference for hedgerow planting. The green infrastructure proposed would complement existing vegetation in the landscape and in all areas of the development, there would remain regular gaps between fields containing development.</p>	
16-8	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Springwell West	<p>At statutory consultation, NKDC noted impacts in Springwell West of particular concern with the Proposed Development (including larger elements such as the substation and cumulative effects from the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation) currently shown in close proximity to visual receptors (particularly the A15) within an open landscape.</p> <p>NKDC was concerned that mitigation planting may foreshorten views, which would be a conspicuous change to the baseline and the mitigation solution along the A15 needs to be fully</p>	<p>Both parties agree with the approach to screening, an assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050]. This assesses amongst other things the effects on views from the A15. The approach to mitigating visual effects from the A15 is outlined in the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028].</p> <p>Following Phase Two Consultation, the proposed siting zone for the BESS and Springwell Substation was drawn back from the A15 such that the Proposed Development now incorporates</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			considered, with a balance struck between screening and integration.	<p>a 250m buffer from the A15. This would maintain a sense of openness along the road and limit the effect on long distance views.</p> <p>In Springwell West, tree belt planting is proposed to extend and connect with existing blocks of woodland such as Bloxholm Wood and Gorse Hill Covert. The precedent for new hedgerow planting on either side of the A15 is evident along sections of the A15 to the north and south of the Order Limits. Feedback from Phase Two Consultation expressed a preference for hedgerow planting along the A15.</p>	Agreed
16-9	Relevant Representation	ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual	<p>Post-hearing submissions at DL3 clarified NKDC's position in relation to the effects on landscape character. NKDC confirmed that <i>'In regards to the Springwell scheme alone, we are in agreement with the applicants' findings within the LVIA of significant adverse landscape effects at a local level.'</i> <i>'At a larger character scale, while the scheme will undoubtedly alter the land use of a large area, the effect will diminish to that at a local level and is unlikely to be significant.'</i></p> <p>See Ref 16-14 for NKDC's position in relation to cumulative landscape character effects at a regional scale.</p>	<p>An assessment of effects on landscape character is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050]. This chapter acknowledges that some significant effects on landscape character would occur and defines the geographical extent of the landscape over which such effects would occur.</p> <p>See Ref 16-14 for the Applicant's position in relation to cumulative landscape character effects at a regional scale.</p> <p>See Ref 16-13 for the Applicant's position in relation to landscape character effects at Year 10 in Springwell East.</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>See Ref 16-13 for NKDC's position in relation to effects on landscape character at Year 10 in Springwell East.</p> <p>The examination process provides the opportunity to review and interrogate the Significant Beneficial effects identified on the existing vegetation structure of the landscape (trees and hedgerows) within the Site by year 10 as the scale and extent of development would also lead to Significant Adverse effects on views from visual receptors.</p> <p>Significant changes to views during construction and early operation, especially for users along PRow and the A15, where screening is insufficient.</p>	<p>The chapter reports that there would be a moderate beneficial effect on landscape fabric (woodland, trees and hedgerows) over the operation lifetime of the Proposed Development and at decommissioning. The Chapter also acknowledges however, that there would be residual adverse effects on visual amenity following the establishment of mitigation planting.</p> <p>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] acknowledges that there would be significant visual effects on users of the A15 although mitigation measures (earthworks and mitigation planting would reduce the magnitude of effect over the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The design strategy for mitigating visual effects on users of the A15 is outlined in the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028].</p> <p>A wider buffer of 250m has been applied to the area where the Springwell Substation and BESS are proposed to be located and new hedgerows</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
16-10	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	National Grid Navenby Substation	<p>NKDC notes that the NGNS is identified as the primary project to potentially general cumulative landscape or visual effects with the Proposed Development.</p> <p>NKDC discusses how there are potential opportunities for the applicants of both projects to coordinate mitigation planting in the area around the National Grid Substation, which is requested to be investigated further by the Council.</p>	<p>are proposed along the road verges for much of the A15 as it passes through the Order Limits.</p> <p>The Applicant noted the suggestion of additional hedgerow planting within the Springwell Order Limits to mitigate the cumulative landscape and visual effects with the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation.</p> <p>A Scoping Report for the National Grid Navenby Substation was submitted in July 2025 but an application has not yet been submitted and therefore details of the proposed application are not available.</p> <p>The Applicant's position in relation to additional hedgerow planting alongside the A15 is set out in its response to ExQ1. National Grid has confirmed that it believes the effects of the National Grid Navenby Substation can be mitigated within its redline boundary.</p> <p>At a meeting between the Applicant and NKDC on 8 July 2025, it was agreed that whilst there may be some minor benefit to implementing this planting, it was unlikely that additional hedgerow planting would result in a material difference to the overall significance of the effect on views from</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				the A15. It was agreed that this additional planting was not essential.	
16-11	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Draft DCO	NKDC and Applicant agree that landscape/ecology mitigation and the provision of a scheme of BNG will be secured via the DCO through detailed LEMP(s) with long-term monitoring and maintenance (10–15 years), aligning with ES assumptions and ensuring delivery of residual effects.	Applicant confirms the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5] sets out Green Infrastructure proposals, growth assumptions (ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050]) and monitoring (Years 1–15). Detailed LEMP(s) will be produced post-consent in accordance with Schedule 2 of the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5] to secure planting establishment, BNG delivery and adaptive management, including replanting if necessary.	Agreed
16-12	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Vegetation removal processes	Clear vegetation removal processes should be put in place to ensure any vegetation loss is aligned with these plans and schedules and further removal or works is agreed with the relevant parties prior to any works being carried out.	<p>Vegetation removal would be limited to that essential for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The vegetation removal parameters are outlined and secured within the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5]. The vegetation removal will be undertaken in accordance with the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.</p>	Agreed
16-13	ISH and Subsequent Correspondence	Landscape Character and impact on landscape character	Landscape Character and the impact on landscape character in Year 10 of operation at Springwell East. In summary, we agree with a moderate adverse assessment for LCA 11 (which covers Springwell East) made within the LVIA, but	ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] finds that there is a significant adverse effect at Year 1 and a moderate adverse effect at Year 10 that is not significant. Landscape mitigation has been	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>it is our judgement this would remain a significant residual adverse effect (whereas the LVIA identifies as Not Significant).</p> <p>We judge that this is still being a direct, large scale land use change across all fields of Springwell East in which above ground infrastructure is proposed. This would be an addition of new elements that will replace a key element of this landscape, influencing character, being a major addition, albeit affecting a relatively localised area of the LCA. Based on the assumptions within the ES of the overall scheme consisting of 1.5 million Solar PV modules to deliver approximately 800MW across the scheme: assuming Springwell East accounts for only a quarter of that, which would be a conservative estimate, this would equate to over 350,000 panels generating up to 200MW in Springwell East alone, which would still be classed as a very large scale solar scheme and well above the current threshold to be considered an NSIP.</p>	<p>proposed which comprises a considerable amount of new planting in Springwell East which would firstly limit the extent of effects. Secondly, it would also notably soften the external appearance of the Proposed Development, which reduces the scale of landscape change. The magnitude of effects considers three elements: scale of change, extent of change and duration of change. The proposed mitigation achieves a reduction in extent and scale of effects and is designed to complement LCA 11. Some of the characteristic features within LCA 11 such as Trundle Lane, for example, would be replicated by the increased height of hedgerows in that area.</p> <p>The Applicants assessment presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] is that at Year 10, effects in LCA 11 (covering Springwell East) would be moderate adverse but that this would not be significant. The Applicant considers that by Year 10 when mitigation planting has achieved a height of 3m although there would remain some views of the Proposed Development, the geographical extent of the effect within LCA 11 would be much reduced and the effect would be not significant.</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
16-14	ISH and Subsequent Correspondence	Regarding wider/regional cumulative effects	<p>The mass and scale of several NSIP scale energy projects combined with Springwell has the potential to lead to adverse effects on landscape character over an extensive area across multiple published character areas. The landscape character of the Lincolnshire region will be altered over the operational period through an extensive area of land use change, and introduction of energy infrastructure in an area that is predominantly of agricultural character and land use; solar development is not identified within current published character assessments. While it is not suggested that agriculture will not remain as a defining characteristic, over a short period of time large scale solar will undoubtedly become a widespread characteristic in the region. Subsequently, we judge that cumulatively solar development would be a key characteristic in any updates to published character assessments from local to national scale.</p>	<p>The order limits of Fosse Green Energy and Leoda Solar Farm extend to within the NCA boundary, the areas of the projects on Plan 1: Cumulative Solar Development and National Character Area 47, Appendix 2 of the Response to First Written Questions (ExQ1) [EN010149/APP/8.14] [REP1-071] that are bereft of colour demonstrate that these are underground components for the cable route and will not be visible in the NCA. Other NSIP scale projects sit outside of the NCA. NCAs follow prominent topographical / geographical features in the landscape, the western boundary follows the Lincoln cliff, for example. There is no real visual connection between the heath above the cliff and the lower lying land to the west where the Proposed Development lies.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that in any update to the published landscape character descriptions at both local and national level, solar farm development would likely be recorded as a new feature. However it does not agree that large scale battery and solar will become a distinctive key characteristic across the region as a whole. The Applicant is of the opinion that rather than it being a case of there being a significant effect on landscape character across the Lincolnshire</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				region as a whole, it is more appropriate to think of there being pockets or tracts of the region where effects would be significant.	
16-18	Post Hearing Submissions at DL3 [REP3-080]	Sequential Cumulative Visual Effects	Sequential cumulative effects would likely be experienced by visual receptors travelling through the wider landscape and experiencing multiple schemes across potentially several kilometres, albeit with gaps between each scheme. Repeated views and presence of large scale solar would undoubtedly increase the susceptibility of receptors to changes in view through visual fatigue in which viewers experience a diminishing capacity to absorb or tolerate repeated or similar visual stimuli (solar development) along routes, eroding views of the rural character and increasing a broader perception of landscape industrialisation. GLVIA3 defines types of cumulative visual effect as either: Combined (in same view) or Sequential. Table 7.1 of GLVIA3, regarding Sequential Cumulative visual effects states: "Sequential: Occurs when the observer has to move to another viewpoint to see the same or different developments. Sequential effects may be assessed for travel along regularly used routes such as major roads or popular paths"	<p>The Applicant does not consider there would be any significant sequential cumulative visual effects in association with the Springwell Solar Farm.</p> <p>The only A-road from which the Proposed Development would be visible is the A15 and it is acknowledged in ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] that there would be a significant visual effect on views from a length of this route as it passes through Springwell West. However, the A15 does not pass through any other operational or proposed solar farms between at least Lincoln and Sleaford or indeed for some distance either side. Consequently, the Applicant does not consider there to be any significant cumulative effect with other solar farms on this route.</p> <p>The parallel B1188 which passes close to Springwell East would experience a very brief view of Springwell Solar Farm but again no other solar farms between Lincoln and Sleaford are particularly noticeable (the scheme at Branston is</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>We judge that the sequential effects would be felt throughout the area, with PROW users, that are more susceptible to changes in their view, moving slowly and often engaging with the landscape attentively; Travel along these PROW presents successive experience with solar infrastructure, creating a sequential visual effect. PROW users traveling along several rights of way have been identified within the applicants LVIA as having significant adverse visual effects at year 10. If users of these routes had previously, or would subsequently, travel on rights of way or other linear routes with views of other solar schemes (as identified in the LVIA's associated with these projects) the implication is that users would likely experience sequential visual effects across two or more schemes, even at Year 10 when mitigation should have matured. Combined with receptors traveling long distances along road corridors in the region with views of the scheme, this can form a coherent visual narrative: a rural area increasingly defined by views of clustered energy-infrastructure development</p>	<p>just glimpsed when passing in winter months). The Applicant does not consider this would constitute a significant cumulative effect on views.</p> <p>There would be no view of the Proposed Development from the A607, therefore, even in the event that there was any glimpse of other solar farms west of the Lincoln Cliff from this road there could be no cumulative effect with Springwell Solar Farm.</p> <p>None of the recognised long-distance footpaths pass both Springwell Solar Farm and another solar farm or would have views of both. The Viking Way which runs along the top of the Lincoln Cliff may have views across the vales to the west and see multiple solar farms if they were constructed but there would be no view of Springwell Solar Farm from this route. Therefore, the Springwell Solar Farm would not contribute to any cumulative visual effects on footpaths across the Lincoln Cliff.</p> <p>Whilst in theory, it would be possible to undertake a journey by car or along a series of interconnected footpaths from east to west passing first Springwell Solar Farm and then eventually passing over the Lincoln Cliff where</p>	



Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant’s Response	Status
				there may be views of Leoda or Fosse Green DCO solar farms, linkages east to west across the Central Plateau are limited and there are no recognised walking or cycling routes which would encourage this. All of the main connections in the landscape run north to south along the Central Plateau and in the event that a visual receptor was to travel past Springwell Solar Farm and then another solar farm in the wider landscape, there would be a considerable break in the journey between views of the different schemes.	

Table 17 – Land, Soil and Groundwater

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
17-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Alternatives	NKDC accepts that the Applicant has minimised BMV land take where feasible, justified its inclusion in accordance with EN-3, and secured reinstatement through the DCO, resulting in an agreed position on the approach to BMV land use.	The Applicant explains that site selection and design followed the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028] and Site Selection Report [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] , applying project principles to minimise use of BMV while balancing constraints such as grid access, land availability, topography and renewable generation need. Of 541.2ha of BMV within the Order Limits, 231.7ha (42.8%) is proposed for built development, with 35.6% of BMV used for solar PV. EN-3 recognises that NSIP solar farms may use BMV land where necessary, and the Final Draft DCO [EN01049/APP/3.1.5] requires decommissioning and restoration after 40 years, limiting long-term impact.	Agreed
17-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to assessment	<p>NKDC disagrees with the methodology that bases impact magnitude solely on the permanent loss of soil functions or volume. This approach does not reflect the temporary loss of agricultural production over the 40-year operational period.</p> <p>NKDC recommends that both permanent and temporary losses be assessed, in line with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant's Response to First Written Questions (ExQ1) [EN010149/APP/8.14] [REP1-071]. Question Q1.9.4 provides a response related to the approach to the assessment for BMV land, particularly related to the fixed equipment (Satellite Collector Compounds, Springwell Substation, Main Collector Compound and BESS). Furthermore, the response to this question has also been addressed in Q1.9.1 within the Applicant's Response to First Written Questions (ExQ1) [EN010149/APP/8.14] [REP1-071].</p> <p>The Applicant maintains that its approach follows industry guidance (IEMA 2022) and is justified in the Scoping</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>Report and ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-014]. The design process sought to minimise impacts on BMV land, with permanent land take limited to 166.2 ha of green infrastructure (77 ha BMV), which provides biodiversity mitigation and enhancement rather than hard development.</p> <p>Both temporary and permanent land uses are assessed (ES Section 11.9.16), with all infrastructure (except cabling) removed after 40 years under the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5], returning land to agricultural use. Permanent planting for biodiversity would remain except where removal is needed to relevel land.</p> <p>Some BMV land use is unavoidable and justified in ES Section 11.9 and the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018]. While food security is recognised as a national debate, it is not raised in the Energy NPSs, NPPF, or Local Plan policies and has therefore not been assessed further.</p>	
17-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent	Approach to assessment	NKDC disagrees that the Applicant places weight on effects being 'temporary' and that permanent 'sealing over' is limited. However, concerns remain regarding temporary uses (satellite collector compounds, BESS, Springwell Substation, and main collector compound) which could	<p>The Applicant confirms that the approach to BMV land assessment follows IEMA guidance (2022) and ExQ1.9.4 of the Response to First Written Questions (ExQ1) [EN010149/APP/8.14] [REP1-071].</p> <p>Areas of permanent land change are limited to green infrastructure (77.1 ha of BMV), which results in a high</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
	Corresponde nce		result in permanent land loss. NKDC also highlights that temporary green infrastructure in field Tb2 and a community growing area may result in up to 20 ha of further permanent BMV land loss over 40 years, which is not fully explained in the ES [LIR paragraphs 18.17–18.21].	<p>magnitude effect, but soil quality will improve through biodiversity net gain measures.</p> <p>All PV areas and temporary works (including the bund in Tb2) are reversible and will be returned to agricultural use at decommissioning. No permanent hardstanding will remain; all infrastructure above-ground is removed. Green infrastructure parameters (Appendix 1, oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5]) show 16 ha of tree belts and 15,563 m of hedgerows as permanent; the remainder, including 100 ha of grassland, is temporary. Landowners have confirmed that temporary areas, including Tb2, are expected to revert to agriculture post-decommissioning.</p>	
17-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to assessment	NKDC note the change in the assessment conclusions to moderate adverse in the submitted ES.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken the assessment in soils in line with the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) Guide: A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment (2022), and draws attention to how the assessment approach has changed since Phase Two Consultation, where: Grade 1 and Grade 2 land are regarded as very high sensitivity in terms of the methodology, and therefore this results in a moderate effect, which is considered to be significant in EIA terms (see Section 11.9 in ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-014])</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
17-5	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	BMV land	NKDC agrees that the Applicant has taken reasonable steps to avoid and reduce impacts on BMV land, including the retention of Grade 1 and 2 fields. NKDC recognises that at this scale, it is likely that applicants' developments will use some agricultural land, including therefore potentially BMV land, which is then required to be set in the overall planning balance of delivering a viable solar project..	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise BMV impacts, prioritising the use of poorer-quality land where consistent with other sustainability considerations. Grade 1 and 2 fields are retained for arable production. Grade 3a land is included as some BMV use is required to achieve a viable NSIP-scale project. Using Grade 3a land rather than Grade 1 or 2 reduces impacts to higher-sensitivity soils.</p> <p>Design measures are secured through the Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3.3] [REP3-028], including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Principle 8.1: Fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 remain for arable use. - Principle 8.2: BMV land prioritised for arable production where practicable. - Principle 8.3: Non-BMV land prioritised for habitat creation where practicable. <p>Fields By18 (Grade 2) and By27 (majority Grade 1) are retained for arable use and for infrastructure needs. Soil management methods will maintain or improve soil quality post-construction (ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-014]; oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11.3] [REP3-042]).</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
17-6	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	BMV land	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with the approach taken on the temporary use of the land intended to be retained for agricultural production within the Order Limits.	Land intended to be retained for agricultural production within the Order Limits includes Grade 1, 2, 3a and 3b land is included for the purposes of the temporary installation of the cabling as shown on the ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2.4] [REP4-015] and following construction will remain as arable use. Following Statutory Consultation, several fields have been removed from the Order Limits due to them being classified as BMV land and not being required for cabling.	Agreed
17-8	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Mitigation	<p>Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with the ALC survey results and design development and principles, which have prioritised the use of non-BMV land where practicable.</p> <p>In its LIR at paragraph 18.15, NKDC agrees that the ALC surveys have been undertaken by a professional team in agreement with Natural England and are considered reliable.</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise impacts on BMV land and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality. This has influenced both the initial site selection process and the subsequent design of the Proposed Development. Fields comprising of solely Grade 1 or 2 land within the Site would remain available for arable production. Section 8 of the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] sets out the Applicant's justification for use of BMV land.</p> <p>Further engagement has been undertaken with NKDC to discuss the ALC survey results and design development and principles which have prioritised the use of non-BMV land where practicable. Further detail on engagement is set out within ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-014].</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
17-9	Relevant Representation	Soil management and Restoration	NKDC notes that suitable soil management and restoration clauses should be included in order to secure the land quality at the end of the term. Noting that if the soil is in substandard condition during the operation of the solar farm, carbon sequestration is reduced and infiltration of water can also be reduced, leading to localised standing water and the reduction in soil quality.	The Applicant has submitted an oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11.3] [REP3-042] with the DCO application. This management plan sets out all of the clauses for management and restoration of the soil during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11.2] [REP1-042] was updated at Deadline 1 at paragraph 14.1.3 to commit to reinstating and returning the land, following the construction phase (construction compounds and access tracks that will not be used for the purposes of the operational phase) and following decommissioning to the ALC grade it was prior to the installation of the Proposed Development.	Agreed
17-10	Relevant Representation	Re-instatement Plan	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with the measures set out in the management plans.	The Applicant has submitted an oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11.3] [REP3-042] with the DCO application. This management plan sets out all of the clauses for management and restoration of the soil during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases including specific methodology and reinstatement plans for the installation of the cabling.	Agreed
17-11	Relevant Representation	Grazing	NKDC's position is that grazing should be secured as part of the package of mitigation measures to ensure that agricultural practices continue on the site.	<p>The Applicant is working with the Blankney Estate to confirm the feasibility of grazing beneath Solar PV modules and in grassland areas.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing for the area beneath the Solar PV development to be converted from arable land to grassland managed through a combination of sheep</p>	Not Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>grazing and/or hay/silage production to maintain the field vegetation during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The Applicant does not rely on grazing as an ongoing agricultural use to mitigate the impact on BMV land; therefore, the Applicant will not commit to grazing as part of the proposed development. This is also set out in the Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearings 2, 3 and 4 [EN010149/APP/8.22] [REP3-075] due to being discussed at ISH 4, Agenda Item 6.</p> <p>Further detail on the operational management is detailed and secured within the oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9.5], which will be discussed at a detailed stage with the relevant local planning authorities.</p> <p>The proposals consider the recommendations in the BRE National Solar Centre Biodiversity Guidance for Solar Developments (2014). Final LEMP details will be developed in consultation with the proposed Ecological Steering Group advocated by LCC.</p>	

Table 18 – Noise and Vibration

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
18-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Approach to assessment	NKDC note that further work should be completed to assess for negative impacts from construction and decommissioning works with modelling and mitigation technologies agreed with host authorities.	<p>The construction and decommissioning noise impacts, as discussed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP3-010], conclude that the impacts are considered not significant.</p> <p>Through the implementation of the oCEMP [EN010149/APP/7.7.5] [REP4-025], oDEMP [EN010149/APP/7.13.5] [REP4-035], and Best Practicable Means (BPM) as defined by the Control of Pollution Act 1974, the noise impacts at receptors in the vicinity of the construction and decommissioning phase activities would be minimised.</p> <p>Should proposed construction methods change, which would increase those levels presented within the noise and vibration chapter, then re-assessment would be undertaken and discussion had with the host authorities.</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
18-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Approach to assessment	<p>NKDC note that a sensitivity has not been assigned to users of PRowWs.</p> <p>NKDC defers this topic to LCC.</p>	<p>Sensitivity has not been assigned to users of PRow in the same manner as those 'fixed' receptors due to the transient use of PRow in comparison to those property receptors utilised in the study area.</p> <p>There is no guidance or standards which identifies PRow (or their users) as noise sensitive. It is anticipated that the sensitivity of any user would be low and that their exposure to noise would be temporary and transient as they move through the area.</p> <p>Whilst construction noise would be evident and occasionally noticeable for users of the PRow, the anticipated levels would not result in prolonged impact along an individual route, and the transitory nature of the construction works (and users of the PRow) will ensure no single PRow is consistently exposed to construction noise for an extended period. Furthermore, it is unlikely that users will experience levels of construction related noise for prolonged</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				periods that will be above the level of the residual noise environment.	
18-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	BESS location	NKDC request that flexibility on the location of the BESS is retained, and the BESS position (and associated noise impact assessment) is not fixed given concern about LVIA implications of locating the BESS in Springwell West.	The Applicant is proposing to locate the BESS within Field Tb2. The exact layout of the BESS within Tb2 would be determined as part of the detailed design stage, should the Application be granted consent. This would take into account environmental factors which are presented in the Environmental Statement [APP-040 - 134] . More detail is available in ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.12] [REP3-010] and ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] [APP-050] .	Agreed

Table 19 – Operation

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
19-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Maintenance activity	<p>Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC agreed with the operational measures set out in the management plans.</p> <p>NKDC note that the impact of maintenance activities during operation should be assessed, stating within the DCO any allowances or flexibility sought to enable maintenance and component replacements to be carried out, mindful that the Applicant may wish to upgrade panels to reflect latest technologies and designs during operation.</p>	During the operational (including maintenance) phase of the Proposed Development, on-site activities would include routine servicing, maintenance, and replacement of solar or BESS equipment as and when required, as well as solar panel cleaning and vegetation management. These would be less than the level of works during construction; therefore, impacts are not considered to be significant. Any maintenance activities will be undertaken in line with the associated mitigation secured in the oOEMP [EN010149/APP/7.10.5] [REP4-033] to ensure the control of noise.	Agreed

Table 20 - Population

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
20-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation/Local Impact Report	Assessment of Agricultural Employment	<p>The Council has set out its position on the loss of agricultural jobs and operations in paragraph 20.17 of its Local Impact Report [REP1-102]</p> <p>NKDC note that information on the number of agricultural jobs lost and total net employment should be developed as part of the DCO Application.</p>	<p>An assessment of employment including agricultural jobs and agricultural land holdings is addressed within ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-016].</p> <p>The Applicant has set out an indicative estimate of the change in FTE employment supported by the agricultural land within the Order Limits by applying the average number of jobs supported in the agricultural sector in Lincolnshire per hectare of agricultural land in the County, assuming a proportional relationship between land and employment.</p> <p>This is intended to be indicative and illustrative, in order to deal with uncertainty related to the scale, intensity and sub-sector of agricultural activity that could hypothetically be supported by the land. It also allows a comparison of employment capacity, with actual employment supported (and people supported to work) within agricultural land holdings in the Order Limits – the latter is described in terms of the effect on people employed.</p> <p>This concludes that the temporary loss of agricultural land represents approximately 0.3% of agricultural land in Lincolnshire, with an indicative capacity for around 30 FTE jobs based on average employment density.</p> <p>There are two agricultural operations within the study area. During the construction phase, it is expected that both operations will lose access to a portion of the land normally available. The operators of agricultural activities within the Site</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>anticipate that the reduction in operating capacity would be met entirely through retirement and a pause on recruitment, resulting in net loss of employment supported, but no redundancy.</p> <p>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013] assesses cumulative impacts of the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land in Lincolnshire. It is concluded that the cumulative impact on agricultural land is minimal and not significant. Appendix 3 of the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] sets out the Applicant's response to relevant policy, including draft amendments to the NPPF (2024).</p>	
20-1b	Local Impact Report	Loss of Food Production	Other comments state that the loss of agricultural operations should be assessed in light of changes to the NPPF with regard to food production.	The Applicant has set out its position regarding the Council's comment on change in agricultural activity, and food security (in the context of the NPPF) at comment LIR 20.17, Table 2-10 (Population) in Response to Deadline 1 Submissions [EN010149/APP/8.20] [REP2-023] .	Not Agreed
20-2	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Skills and Education Package	<p>NKDC and the Applicant are aligned on progressing a s106 agreement to deliver the Plan's objectives.</p> <p>Consistent with its approach at Heckington Fen Solar Park (Ref: EN010123), NKDC seeks a Skills and Education package via a s106</p>	<p>An Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010149/APP/7.20] [APP- 0153] aims to maximise local economic benefits through employment, skills development, and supply chain opportunities. It includes commitments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide employment and skills opportunities for all, including NEET young people; - Enable local businesses to engage in the supply chain; 	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>Agreement with financial contributions. This would complement the Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan and R16 of the dDCO, supporting beneficial effects post-development. NKDC and LCC have requested s106 funding for elements of the Plan. NKDC is party to a new SOCG with the Applicant, which includes a skills and employment package. The Council welcomes this and will work constructively with the Applicant to progress the s106 agreement for Examination submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communicate workforce and skills requirements to stakeholders; - Inspire local talent and support regional education and training to meet future workforce needs. <p>Delivery may involve the Applicant, contractors, or third parties, supported by an Education and Skills Fund (£50,000 annually, up to £2,100,000) to support upskilling, career development, and regional green construction capacity. The Applicant has engaged with NKDC on the Plan and s106 agreement, preparing draft agreements for ongoing discussion.</p>	Agreed
20-3	ISH 3, Point 14	Action	Tourism and PRow	<p>NKDC is concerned that use of PRow important to tourism (including the Stepping Out Network) may decline, and has engaged with the Applicant to discuss the potential for monitoring use of the existing and new PRow and Permissive Path network in and around the Order Limits.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with NKDC to consider potential approaches to mitigation and monitoring.</p> <p>The Applicant is in agreement with NKDC that evidenced effects of the Proposed Development on PRow use, and then the translated effect in terms of tourism, would be difficult to evidence directly through monitoring.</p>	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			NKDC acknowledges that effects (which may be cumulative) would be difficult to evidence in relation to the Proposed Development specifically.	The Applicant's detailed position summarising the matter and engagement undertaken with NKDC is set out in response to ExA Q 2.12.3.	

Table 21 – Public Rights of Way and Permissive Footpaths

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
21-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Approach to assessment	NKDC defers this topic to LCC.	<p>An assessment of pedestrian amenity is presented in ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [AS-010]. This includes assessment of temporary diversions to limit increases to journey times.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced an oPROWPPMP [EN010149/APP/7.12.3] [REP3-044] which sets out how the Applicant is proposing to manage PRow and permissive pathways to ensure they are safe and accessible throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Any diversion requirements would be outlined at detailed design.</p>	Agreed
21-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Enhancement	NKDC defers this topic to LCC.	<p>The Applicant has considered relevant policies within Appendix A of the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan as part of the design of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>In line with the objectives in the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan, the Proposed Development would include a permanent upgrade to the existing PRow between Scopwick and Blankney (Spires and Steeples Trail) to bridleway status (approx. length 2,090m) as secured by Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.42] [REP3-030]. These proposed upgrades include sections of the proposed route(s) detailed in Appendix A of the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>This is outlined in ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-002].</p>	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
21-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Public Rights of Way and Permissive Footpaths in Springwell Central	NKDC defers this topic to LCC.	<p>Where possible and practicable, the Applicant has sought to include the suggestions within the proposals.</p> <p>With specific reference to the suggested routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete missing section of Rows/5/1 onto B1191, extension of Rowston PF 5 to connect to road: The existing missing section is informally along a track serving water utility infrastructure. Due to vehicle access and parties rights over the track (including MoD), and there being insufficient space on the track it is not possible to segregate vehicles and a PRow. The Applicant does not plan to use the access track or carry out any works to it. The informal use of the track is considered to remain adequate. - Consider new section of permissive path from edge of RAF Digby to connect into Scop/12/1 at field BcD066 (behind hedge line) with verge improvement and possible TRO 30mph speed limit change: A new PRow is proposed to link RAF Digby to Scopwick (approx. length 1,670m) behind the existing hedgerow, connecting to the existing footpath at Scopwick and 30mph zone with a speed limit reduction extension included within the DCO. 	Agreed
21-4	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Public Rights of Way and Permissive Footpaths in Springwell West	NKDC defers this topic to LCC.	<p>Where possible and practicable, the Applicant has sought to include the suggestions within the proposals.</p> <p>With specific reference to the suggested routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Realignment of Temp/2/1 onto Gorse Lane: This was not included due to access requirements of the Proposed Development. 	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diversion of Ashby de la Lande PF/4 and potential historic continuation extinguished: This was not progressed as alternative provisions have been agreed across the Order Limits. - Diversion of Ashby de la Lande PF/2: Further engagement with LCC Highways and PRow officers confirmed that this was not required. - Complete missing section of AshL/4/1: The Applicant is proposing to create a new PRow connecting the existing PRow (AshL/4/1) west of the A15 (near Navenby Lane) to New England Lane. (approx. length 830m). - Link Brau/5/1 with AshL/11/1: The Applicant is proposing new permissive pathways which would provide increased connectivity to Brauncewell. This includes a new permissive path along the western edge of the Proposed Development linking New England Lane to Temple Road, north of Brauncewell (approx. length 4,130m) and a new permissive path linking Bloxholm Wood to Brauncewell Village (approx. length 1,120m). - Consider whether AshL/11/1 can be linked with Brau/8/1: A new PRow from Temple Road (north of Brauncewell) to the Bloxholm Woods Car Park to provide a connection across the A15 (approx. length 990m) would link AshL/11/1 and Brau/8/1. 	

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				<p>This is also considered to address request: Extension of Ashby de la Launde PF/11 can be linked to B1191.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create new path along Cuckoo Lane south of RAF Digby towards New England Lane for the benefit of MOD personnel: This suggestion has not been progressed. - Continuation of Cuckoo Lane at the eastern end to meet the adopted highway to the east: This suggestion has not been progressed. - New route linking Ten Acre Planation and Brauncewell (PF11 and PF6) is considered to be a positive enhancement to the Proposed Development: This is noted. The Applicant is proposing a number of new permissive pathways to provide better connectivity between Ten Acre Plantation, Bloxholm Wood and Brauncewell Village (approx. length 1,120m). 	

Table 22 – Traffic and Transport

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
22-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Access points	NKDC note that existing breaks in field boundaries should be utilised for both construction and permanent access to minimise vegetation loss.	Existing breaks in the hedgerows along the highway boundary have been prioritised as locations for site access points. Where not feasible due to the visibility requirements to/from the access, proximity of tree roots or other environmental impacts, alternative locations for accesses are proposed. All access points would be permanent and would be used for maintenance access during operation. Details of the access locations are included in the oCTMP [EN010149/APP/7.8.4] [REP4-028].	Agreed
22-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Decommissioning	NKDC note that the ES should present measures for early decommissioning in case of early cessation of energy generation, including future baseline traffic flows that aren't solely based at year 40.	Decommissioning is considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [AS-010], noting that any requirements from a traffic movement perspective would not be greater than those within the construction phase, where future baseline traffic flows are not solely based at year 40. The assessment of decommissioning impacts within ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [AS-010] also states that mitigation measures would be similar to that implemented during construction. Baseline traffic data is not provided for decommissioning at this stage as it is too far in the future to reasonably predict those levels, however decommissioning measures are controlled through the oDEMP [EN010149/APP/7.13.5] [REP4-035].	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			Decommissioning must also be in accordance with Requirement 19 of the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5] which requires that decommissioning be no later than 40 years after the date of final commissioning. Any early decommissioning would be expected to require the same measures and mitigation as that for planned decommissioning.	
22-3	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation	Planning policy NKDC note that the Sleaford Transport Strategy will be relevant in considering construction impacts on the A17 corridor and Holdingham Roundabout area (including cumulative effects).	<p>Elements within the Sleaford Transport Strategy, including the A17 corridor and Holdingham Roundabout have been considered as part of the ES Volume 1 Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1.5] [REP4-013] but did not meet the long or short-list of cumulative developments for further consideration presented within ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1.2] [AS-010] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3] [APP-123].</p> <p>The long and short-list of cumulative developments to be considered for cumulative assessment was agreed in liaison with the Local Highways Authority.</p>	Agreed

Table 23 - Water

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
23-1	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Drainage	NKDC note that above ground drainage features should be utilised to be as multi-functional as possible embodying SuDS principles, with design coordinated to exploit opportunities for additional habitat creation as well as surface water retention.	The Outline Drainage Strategy (which forms an appendix to the Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16.3] [REP1-050]) details that surface water attenuation for the Springwell Substation and BESS areas would likely be provided within basins. Biodiversity would be considered further as part of detailed design of drainage systems, should development consent be granted.	Agreed
23-2	S42 Consultation response to 2024 Consultation and Subsequent Correspondence	Flood risk	Through ongoing engagement and additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 and 2, NKDC is satisfied with the additional details on the Sequential Test.	The application of the Sequential Test is detailed within the Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2.2] [AS-018] as agreed with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council and the exception test is detailed within the Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16.3] [REP1-050] .	Agreed

Table 24 – Draft Development Consent Order and Requirements

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
24-1	Relevant Representation	Requirement on timescales – Grid Connection	<p>NKDC notes that they would like to ensure an additional requirement is included in the draft DCO to restrict the commencement of the Springwell solar farm until the proposed NGNS has reached a meaningful point of construction.</p> <p>NKDC note and support the principle of the additional Requirement suggested by the ExA.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant considers this is not necessary. As recorded in the Grid Connection Statement [EN010149/APP/7.6.2] [REP1-058], the Applicant has a grid connection offer at the proposed Navenby Substation, and the Applicant is aware that National Grid intends to seek planning permission for the substation by way of a Town and Country Planning Act (1990) Application to NKDC.</p> <p>The Applicant is not aware of any obvious reason why the proposed Navenby Substation would not receive planning permission. In terms of the suggestion that the commencement of the Proposed Development should be in some way be restricted based on milestones achieved for the Navenby Substation, there is no justification for this approach. Firstly, the Applicant already has its grid connection offer. Further, the Applicant considers that such a requirement could prevent the Proposed Development from being carried out in a timely and efficient manner, which is not appropriate having regard to the urgent need to deliver renewable energy.</p> <p>Finally, the Applicant's decision to commence construction of the Proposed Development would also be driven by commercial considerations, and it is highly unlikely that the Applicant would construct the</p>	Not agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
				Proposed Development without sufficient confidence that a grid connection would be in place for the export of the energy generated.	
24-2	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Requirement 11	<p>NKDC raise concerns that the wording of proposed Requirement 11 is not suitable as it is vague and unenforceable. Would like to see the wording from the recently approved Mallard Pass and Cottam solar farms is included in this requirement.</p> <p>NKDC defers this topic to LCC.</p>	The Applicant has been engaging with both NKDC and LCC on requirement 11, which has been updated within the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5] .	Agreed
24-3	ExQ1 Response	Articles 40 and 41	<p>Article 40 states that subject to paragraph (2) and article 41, the undertaker may fell or lop any tree or shrub near any part of the development for maintenance purposes as set out in the dDCO.</p> <p>NKDC note that the government's guidance on drafting DCOs recommends, in respect of provisions in relation to hedgerows and protected trees, that a schedule of each are provided within the DCO. The Council considers that a similar approach</p>	The Applicant has been engaging with both NKDC and LCC on Articles 40 and 41 which has been updated within the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5] and all matters are agreed between the two parties.	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
			<p>should be taken in respect of non-protected trees and shrubs.</p> <p>As such, NKDC consider that the developer should set out a schedule and provide a map of the location of the trees and shrubs to which this article relates. NKDC consider that this would assist the Council in its duties to investigate any breach of the DCO's provisions in the interests of expediency.</p> <p>NKDC consider that Article 40 should include provisions to inform the relevant planning authority before any felling or lopping is undertaken and to replace any trees or shrubs that are felled under its provisions.</p> <p>Article 41 is concerned with works to trees subject to a tree preservation order (TPO) that is within the Order limits and was made after November 2024. No TPOs have been made to date. The Council requests a provision is made to ensure that where possible, the undertaker seeks to replace any trees that are removed.</p>		

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
24-4	Relevant Representation and Subsequent Correspondence	Planning Fees – Schedule 16	NKDC notes that there is an increase in planning fees that is due to be introduced in April 2025 and requests that a proportionate increase is reflected in the fees set out in Schedule 16. As set out in paragraphs 9.13-9.14 of NKDC's Written Representation, Further information and consultation (3) requires the relevant authority to notify the undertaker of any further information that is considered necessary or that is requested by the requirement consultee within 15 working days of receipt. (6)(a) requires that a requirement consultee should provide comments on an application to the relevant planning authority within 10 working days of receipt. Due to the capacity and availability of consultees, the Council requests that (3) is extended to 20 working days and (6)(a) is extended to 15 working days, as a minimum in both cases. This request is in line with recent DCO decisions on Lincolnshire solar farms.	The Applicant has reviewed NKDC's position and the additional information submitted at Deadline 2, and has agreed to amend Schedule 16 of the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5] accordingly.	Agreed

Ref.	Source	Description of Matter	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant's Response	Status
24-5	Subsequent Correspondence	DCO Schedule 16 para 3.6 - timescale for LPA determining additional information	The Council considers that 2 working days is insufficient to allow for a review of additional information. Such information might comprise the submission of amendments to technical reports which could be more time consuming to review. The Council notes the revised offer (5 working days, or longer as agreed) and we have reverted with an alternative compromise suggestion of 10 working days (or longer as agreed).	<p>The Applicant, believes that since this stage is primarily about verifying whether the provided information meets the original request (rather than conducting a full reassessment), the Applicant prefer to maintain a shorter timeframe so that progress can continue.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing to update the DCO wording to say: <i>'5 working days, or such longer period as is agreed (including where the quantity of information is substantial or requirement consultees are involved).'</i> As stated in the Final Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.5].</p>	Not Agreed

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of North Kesteven District Council

Name: [REDACTED]

Signature:

[REDACTED]

Date: 6th October 2025

On behalf of the Applicant

Name: [REDACTED]

Signature:

[REDACTED]

Date: 6th October 2025



springwellsolarfarm.co.uk