



# **Frodsham Solar**

## **Consultation Report**

### **Appendix 9: Phase Two Section 47 Applicant Response**

**May 2025**



PINS Ref: EN010153

Document Ref: EN010153/DR/5.2

**Planning Act 2008; and Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(q)**

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Statutory Phase Two Section 47 Applicant Responses .....</b>	<b>3</b>
	Phase Two Section 47 Applicant Responses.....	3

# 1 Statutory Phase Two Section 47 Applicant Responses

## Phase Two Section 47 Applicant Responses

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
Ecology and biodiversity		
FS2_OFF_012, FS2_OFF_014, FS2_OFF_017, FS2_FF_013	Respondents expressed concern about damage to the local ecology, ecosystems and biodiversity, from the construction phase to throughout the project	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of the ecological impacts of the Proposed Development, which has been informed by site-specific surveys over multiple years to understand the extent to which the Site is used by nature. The assessment is reported within <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 7: Terrestrial Ecology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>In summary, the Site hosts a range of ecological receptors, from internationally protected birds to locally important habitats and species. The Proposed Development has been carefully designed with embedded mitigation and enhancement measures to avoid significant harm and to provide environmental benefits. Designated sites (internationally and locally designated) are safeguarded and even enhanced through habitat creation. Important habitats on site are largely retained and bolstered with new habitat features. Notable species groups – including birds, bats, water vole, otter, great crested newt, badger, reptiles, and invertebrates – have all been considered, with mitigation tailored to each. The assessments find that no significant long-term residual adverse effects are expected on any important ecological feature as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_014, FS2_OFF_053, FS2_EF_005	<p>Respondents voiced concern that the planned planting will not be suitable for wildlife such as foxes, hares and stoats which should be of equal importance.</p> <p>A respondent requested that the planned wildlife corridors are going to be an adequate enough size to support all bird and animal life.</p> <p>A respondent stated that the developer has to address the loss in natural habitat for wildlife.</p>	<p>The wildlife corridors through the Site would support a range of species as part of the ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals across the Site. These corridors are shown illustratively on <b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b>.</p>
FS2_OFF_011	<p>Respondent suggested introduction of new species to increase the biodiversity of the site.</p>	<p>The likely typical planting mixes are set out in the <b>outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> and include a range of native species suitable for the Site.</p>
FS2_EF_005	<p>Respondent asked if the planned wildlife corridors are an adequate size to support all bird and animal life currently residing where the solar farm will go.</p>	<p>The wildlife corridors through the Site would support a range of species as part of the ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals incorporated into the Proposed Development. These corridors are shown illustratively on <b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b>.</p>
FS2_OFF_055	<p>Respondent asked what strategy and steps are being taken to mitigate and rectify any adverse impact on wildlife and the local area during the construction phase and any unanticipated impacts discovered post-construction and as a result of the installation's operation.</p>	<p>The Applicant has followed the mitigation hierarchy to avoid and reduce the environmental impacts of the Proposed Development. Specific mitigation measures in relation to ecology are set out in Section 7.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 7: Terrestrial Ecology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> and Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b>.</p>
FS2_OFF_024	<p>Respondent stated that the proposed area is far more suitable for the flora and fauna that is preexisting in the area.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_025	Respondent requested any data presented determining whether there has been a biodiversity net gain/loss.	<p>The <b>Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010153/DR/7.12]</b> sets out the Applicant's full assessment of BNG in line with national requirements. The BNG calculation and report is based on DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will generate a net change of +191.74 (11.23 %) habitat units, +66.77 (123.06 %) hedgerow units and +14.65 (13.11%) watercourse units. The Proposed Development meets all trading principles, with the exception of the loss of reedbed.</p>
FS2_OFF_031	Respondent believes there should be more mitigation areas and the land around the panels should be actively managed for wildlife.	<p>The Applicant is proposing a comprehensive ecological mitigation strategy, with proposed habitats shown on <b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b> and the outline maintenance and management prescriptions set out in the <b>outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b>.</p>
FS2_OFF_036	Respondent asked if the site will be better for local wildlife than the land currently is.	<p><b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 7: Terrestrial Ecology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> conclude that the application of the mitigation hierarchy and the commitment to habitat enhancement ensure that the Proposed Development will cause no significant ecological harm. On the contrary, it will secure long-term biodiversity benefits, leaving the Site and its surroundings with greater ecological value and resilience.</p>



Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_038	Respondent stated that the area around the Weaver has big hedges and fields which would not survive under solar panels.	As set out in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> , the layout of the Proposed Development incorporates wide buffers to existing hedgerows and vegetation.
FS2_FF_015, FS2_EF_005	Respondent stated that screening was essential along the public rights of way to minimise disturbance to bird/wildlife.	Provision has been made for screening along sections of new permissive paths which are adjacent to areas which could give rise to disturbance see <b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: (a-e) Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3] and Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . These measures would have a dual purpose and would be intended to prevent disturbance to birds by movement of people along adjacent routes, and also to provide opportunities for bird watching.
FS2_OFF_038	Respondent stated that the deposit lagoons are not currently of great ecological value, they have a great deal of potential. It could be turned into much better wetland habitat which given its location next to the estuary would be very important. The respondent stated that these lagoons could be sterilised when covered with solar panels.	The Applicant notes this comment. The deposit lagoons form part of the Non-Breeding Bird Mitigation Strategy which is set out at Appendix B of the <b>outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
FS2_OFF_038	Respondent stated that the proposed wetland mitigation is an improvement. The respondent asked what plans there are for management by a wildlife organisation.	As set out in <b>Section 4.0 of the ES Vol 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> the Applicant envisages that the NBBMA would be managed by, or under the supervision of, an organisation experienced in stewardship of wetland reserves, such as the Local Wildlife Trust or the RSPB, and with the support of Frodsham Solar.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that the 10% biodiversity net gain using the Statutory BNG metric is welcomed, the respondent asked how the areas beneath the panels will be assessed. They stated that the justification that BNG 'trading rules' do not need to be met due to its limited ecological connectivity making its loss acceptable requires strong evidence.	<p>The <b>Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010153/DR/7.12]</b> sets out the Applicant's full assessment of BNG in line with national requirements. The BNG calculation and report is based on DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric.</p> <p>The Proposed Development, when including the NBBMA, will generate a net change of +194 (11.52 %) habitat units, +48.25 (88.92%) hedgerow units and +14.65 (13.35%) watercourse units. The Proposed Development meets all trading principles, with the exception of the loss of reedbed. The <b>Biodiversity Net Gain Report [EN010153/DR/7.12]</b> sets out the position regarding the treatment of reedbeds and the fact that several of the areas of 'reedbed' classified under the UKHab system are transient in nature and it is likely that these would be lost in the short to medium term in the do-nothing scenario.</p>
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that there is conflicting information in PEIR, which in the NTS references managing the grassland beneath panels to increase its biodiversity value. The respondent added that this does not seem likely to be viable, given that it will be heavily shaded. Alternatively, the PEIR states that it will be retained in poor condition. The respondent concluded that they do not believe it is possible to retain a habitat in worse condition.	At present, large areas of the Site are either arable and used for cereal production or are intensively grazed. The solar farm will enable the areas of the site currently in arable use (which is of low biodiversity value) to be managed as neutral grassland which would have a greater biodiversity value. Within areas of the site that are currently subject to intensive grazing, the quality of the grassland would be enhanced through a grazing or maintenance regime focused on improving biodiversity value. The height of the panels, and

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		gaps between rows will mean that the light conditions are sufficient to allow good quality grassland to develop.
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that the proposed loss of reedbed habitat raises concerns.	Noted. However, as set out in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 7: Terrestrial Ecology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> many of the clumps of reeds on the Site are considered unlikely to function in the same way as larger and ecologically connected areas of the reedbed. Areas of the site, for example, adjacent to Marsh Farm, have been identified for enhancement and creation of high-quality open water and reedbed mosaic see <b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: (a-e) Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b> .
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that one of the potential substation sites is located at the largest reedbed areas, stating that this does not appear to be suitable. The respondent asked if there is a risk of groundwater flooding and if emergency access can be maintained at all times.	The risks of groundwater flooding are considered in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 9: Flood Risk, Drainage and Surface Water [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 9-1: Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b> . This identifies that this area of the Site is not at high risk of groundwater flooding. However, there is a slight low spot in this area which has created damp conditions where an area reed has established. This is an example of an area of reeds which is likely to be a transient habitat and does not function in the same way as a larger and ecologically connected area of reedbed.



Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_061	Respondent stated that mitigation for wildlife should be a priority and not just a small and box ticking exercise, the area is used for local residents and visitors who benefit from the area's rich wildlife.	The Proposed Development includes measures to enhance public access in an ecologically sensitive manner, fostering appreciation of wildlife whilst minimising disturbance. New permissive paths through the Site will be guided to less sensitive areas, and designated wildlife viewing points with screening (such as bird hides or viewing screens) will be installed at strategic locations. Informative signage will be placed to encourage responsible behaviour (e.g. keeping dogs on leads) in the vicinity of important habitats. These measures will enhance the educational and recreational value of the Site, turning it into a well-managed nature-rich area accessible to the public.
FS2_FF_012	Respondent believes that the size of the project should be reduced to protect wildlife.	The Applicant notes this comments. There is a need for the project to deliver a substantial amount of renewable electricity generation, and this overarching objective has guided the scale of the project.
FS2_EF_006	Respondent stated that they appreciate that it is planned to increase biodiversity by setting aside a large area for ground nesting birds in the mile wide zone between the two separated groups of wind turbines. Fig 2-3a (PEIR) indicates that more planned hedgerows will support this goal.	The Applicant notes this comment.
<b>Ornithology</b>		
FS2_OFF_008, FS2_EF_005, FS2_OFF_025, FS2_OFF_038, FS2_OFF_065	Respondents support the proposed bird mitigation areas.	The Applicant notes this comment.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_013, FS2_OFF_020, FS2_OFF_031	Respondent voiced concern about the impact the development will have on the birds in the area.	The Environmental Statement confirms that there are no significant residual impacts on birds resulting from the Proposed Development. This conclusion is based on the implementation of the avoidance and mitigation hierarchy, as outlined in Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . Additionally, the construction programme has been designed to be phased to minimise potential displacement impacts. Habitat enhancement measures, including the creation of 64 ha of wetland and grassland within the North Bank Bird Mitigation Area (NBBMA) and 28 ha within the Skylark Mitigation Area (SMA), will compensate for any habitat loss resulting from the Development.
FS2_OFF_005	Respondent noted concern regarding the international importance of the area in the migration of significant numbers of birds, stating that this fact makes the proposed inappropriate and unacceptable.	The Applicant acknowledges the international significance of the Mersey Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. The Proposed Development has been designed to enhance functionally linked land (FLL) associated with the SPA, as confirmed in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . Measures proposed within the NBBMA (Appendix B of <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> ) aim to improve habitat quality for species listed under the SPA, such as lapwing and black-tailed godwit. The conclusions of the <b>Information to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment</b>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		<b>[EN010153/DR/5.3]</b> confirm that there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of the SPA.
FS2_OFF_020	Respondent voiced concern about not being able to engage in bird watching.	Public access has been carefully considered in order to balance opportunities for recreation with the need to protect sensitive ecological areas. New permissive footpaths will include visual screening and appropriate signage to minimise disturbance to bird populations. In addition, designated viewpoints and bird hides will be installed to manage public observation in a controlled manner, all as outlined in the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
FS2_OFF_035	Respondent stated that the area is a bird habitat.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_037	Respondent stated that they do not understand how birds will be able to differentiate between the two separate mitigation areas.	The Applicant confirms that the NBBMA and SMA are designed to serve distinct ecological functions, but the areas are also not exclusively for specific bird species. The NBBMA will be managed primarily for wetland birds, particularly those associated with the SPA, and will include dynamic water features such as scrapes. In contrast, the SMA is focused on grassland and arable habitat

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		creation for skylark and other ground nesting bird populations.
FS2_OFF_038	Respondent stated that the bird mitigation areas should exist already, making this mitigation not one for the solar farm. The respondent added that broken promises such as bird mitigation areas make people in the conversation movement cynical.	The Applicant acknowledges existing mitigation measures implemented for the Frodsham Wind Farm and confirms that the NBBMA will provide additional and enhanced mitigation. Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> describes how the NBBMA builds upon previous measures by incorporating features such as prolonged wet periods and predator control. Furthermore, the NBBMA will be managed independently to ensure long-term delivery and maintenance, as outlined in Appendix B of the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
FS2_OFF_038	Respondent stated that the proposed skylark mitigation area is badly drained and asked if there will be any other habitat features.	The design of the SMA takes into account the ecological needs of skylarks. Proposed measures include the establishment of skylark plots or meadow grassland, as referenced in Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> .
FS2_OFF_052	Respondent stated that mitigation is not ideal and not good practice, noting that the marshes are an important site globally for birds.	In the medium to long-term the Proposed Development will contribute positively to the ecological importance of the Mersey Estuary. The creation of 64 hectares of new wetland and other habitats within the NBBMA will provide valuable habitat. Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8:</b>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		<b>Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> notes the scarcity of managed wetland habitats along the Mersey corridor, and highlights the strategic ecological benefits delivered by the Proposed Development.
FS2_OFF_052	A respondent stated that allowing more public access to the marshes is not a good thing and would further disturb the bird population.	The Proposed Development includes measures to enhance public access in an ecologically sensitive manner, fostering appreciation of wildlife whilst minimising disturbance. New permissive paths through the Site will be guided to less sensitive areas, and designated wildlife viewing points with screening (such as bird hides or viewing screens) will be installed at strategic locations. Informative signage will be placed to encourage responsible behaviour (e.g. keeping dogs on leads) in the vicinity of important habitats. These measures will enhance the educational and recreational value of the Site, turning it into a well-managed nature-rich area accessible to the public.
FS2_OFF_053	Respondent requested expanding the non-breeding bird mitigation area.	The Applicant considers the 64-hectare NBBMA to be sufficient to mitigate for displacement impacts associated with the Proposed Development. Habitat requirements have been calculated using ecological survey data presented in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> .

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_059	Respondent stated that the area is outstanding for bird migration overwintering and summer breeding rarities, the respondent added that this needs to be incorporated into any new proposals.	The Environmental Statement confirms that there are no significant residual impacts on birds resulting from the Proposed Development. This conclusion is based on the implementation of the avoidance and mitigation hierarchy, as outlined in Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> .
FS2_OFF_060	Respondent noted concern that important areas for the bird habitat may be lost as a result of the changes in land use.	The Environmental Statement confirms that there are no significant residual impacts on birds resulting from the Proposed Development. This conclusion is based on the implementation of the avoidance and mitigation hierarchy, as outlined in Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . Additionally, the construction programme has been designed to be phased to minimise potential displacement impacts. Habitat enhancement measures, including the creation of 64 ha of wetland and grassland within the North Bank Bird Mitigation Area (NBBMA) and 28 ha within the Skylark Mitigation Area (SMA), will compensate for any habitat loss resulting from the Development.
FS2_FF_007	Respondent stated that in the mitigation areas it will become important that there is ongoing maintenance and care over those areas.	Long-term management of mitigation areas is secured by the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . Monitoring is scheduled to take place in years 1, 2, 5, and at five-year intervals thereafter. Where monitoring identifies that ecological targets are not being met, remedial actions will be implemented, in accordance with



Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
FS2_OFF_058	Respondent stated that the proposed layout utilises lots of habitat already used for breeding and wintering birds and mammals. The respondent added that the loss of this will result in a poorer biodiverse habitat. The respondent concluded that it is crucial that the areas marked for breeding and non-breeding birds is delivered and maintained to achieve these goals. The respondent added that access around the marsh is also imperative for bird monitoring and all footpaths must be maintained and the new permissive paths must be followed through.	The Environmental Statement confirms that there are no significant residual impacts on birds resulting from the Proposed Development. This conclusion is based on the implementation of the avoidance and mitigation hierarchy, as outlined in Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . Additionally, the construction programme has been designed to be phased to minimise potential displacement impacts. Habitat enhancement measures, including the creation of 64 ha of wetland and grassland within the North Bank Bird Mitigation Area (NBBMA) and 28 ha within the Skylark Mitigation Area (SMA), will compensate for any habitat loss resulting from the Development. Management measures for the on-site habitats is set out within the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> which is secured by a requirement of the draft DCO.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_057	Respondent stated that previous permission for development and installation of the nearby wind farm resulted in failure within the agreement in allowing and maintaining an area for wading birds to roost over hightide of the Mersey. The respondent added that the local farmer continued to allow cattle and sheep in the area destroying the natural habitats of many amber listed birds.	The Applicant acknowledges existing mitigation measures implemented for the Frodsham Wind Farm and confirms that the NBBMA will provide additional and enhanced mitigation. Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> describes how the NBBMA builds upon previous measures by incorporating features such as prolonged wet periods and predator control. Furthermore, the NBBMA will be managed independently to ensure long-term delivery and maintenance, as outlined in Appendix B of the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
<b>Landscape and visual</b>		
FS2_OFF_007, FS2_OFF_009, FS2_OFF_012, FS2_OFF_014, FS2_OFF_017, FS2_OFF_023, FS2_OFF_032, FS2_OFF_033, FS2_OFF_053	Respondents expressed concern about the visual impact of the project.	<b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> does identify significant residual adverse visual effects, but only for the users of the PRowWs that pass through the Proposed Development. No significant effects are predicted for any residential properties. These effects cannot be further mitigated through the mitigation hierarchy. Paragraph 5.10.13 of National Policy Statement EN-1 acknowledges that major energy projects are “ <i>likely to have visual effects for many receptors around proposed sites</i> ”.
FS2_OFF_031, FS2_OFF_032, FS2_OFF_033, FS2_OFF_065	Respondents expressed concern about the scale and size of the project.	As set out in Section 2.0 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010153/DR/5.6]</b> , Government has identified that there is a critical need for various types of renewable and low carbon energy,

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		including solar. The Proposed Development is large-scale to contribute towards meeting this established need.
FS2_OFF_054, FS2_OFF_065	Respondents stated that the proposed mitigation strategies are likely to be deciduous planting which won't be effective year-round. The respondent further stated that alternative screening methods or PV panel adjustments should be considered.	The seasonal effect of any existing or proposed planting is considered as part of the assessment in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . Mitigation measures for visual impacts are set out in Section 6.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . The planting proposals being put forward are being put forward to ensure that they achieve their mitigation aims, and the local planning authority will have approval of them to ensure that this is the case.
FS2_OFF_033, FS2_OFF_051	Respondents stated that the visual mitigation plans concentrate on low-level observers and not those from a higher view	<b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> includes an assessment from elevated positions including at Frodsham Hill and Helsby Hill and concludes that visual effects would not be significant. Mitigation measures such as planting for screening would not be effective given the change in elevation.
FS2_OFF_032, FS2_OFF_051, FS2_OFF_066	Respondents stated that areas of panels should be interspersed with green cover and should be screened from the many high viewpoints by higher growth.	The Proposed Development incorporates hedgerows and planting throughout the layout to provide screening from public rights of way and other visual receptors. The planting proposals are shown illustratively on <b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b> .

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_003, FS2_OFF_020	<p>A respondent stated concern regarding the visual impact when walking through the marshes.</p> <p>Another respondent requested visual mitigation for any roads and concreted surfaces as part of the project.</p>	<p><b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> does identify significant residual adverse visual effects for the users of the PRoWs that pass through the Proposed Development. These effects cannot be further mitigated through the mitigation hierarchy. The Proposed Development's enhancement measures (improved recreational access) help make the overall experience for users acceptable despite the change in views – effectively the project is enhancing what was previously private farmland into a managed recreational landscape albeit within a solar development.</p>
FS2_OFF_053, FS2_FF_010	<p>Respondent requested a height reduction in solar panels, stating that 3 metres + from the ground is too tall.</p>	<p>The height of the panels is justified in order to optimise energy generation across the Site, ensuring an efficient use of land. The height of the panels has been increased slightly in the east of the Site for DCO submission to account for flood risk. The height of the panels is accounted for in the assessment contained within <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> and is shown on the photomontage visualisations contained within <b>ES Volume 3 [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b>.</p>
FS2_OFF_026	<p>Respondent stated that where low hedges have been installed to retain views (specifying alongside restricted byway 108), these must be maintained at a height which achieves that aim at all times.</p>	<p>The management of existing and proposed landscape elements is secured by the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b>.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_016	Respondent stated they live directly opposite the solar farm overlooking the river in Hale. They added that their view has already been impacted by the wind farm.	The Applicant notes this comment. Views from this area have been assessed with reference to Viewpoint 1 in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> .
FS2_OFF_032	Respondent voiced concern about the lack of effort that has gone into preserving the visual amenity of the green, open marshes. The respondent added that the photomontages/visualisations show less shrub/hedgerow planting than at present.	The <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> sets out the design approach that has been followed to mitigate impacts on the Frodsham marshes. The photomontages illustrate the proposed planting shown on <b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b> .
FS2_OFF_042	Respondent stated that the views from Frodsham Hill have been assessed well but Heath in Runcorn is also an important viewpoint. The respondent then suggested a photomontage from the top of the ridge in Runcorn, adding that there will be a clear view of the site from there.	The Applicant has now included Viewpoint 30 as part of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . This has been used to inform the assessment of the effects on views from Runcorn, which are assessed to not be significant.
FS2_OFF_053	Respondent requested greater use of fast-growing hedgerows to hide the development. The respondent stated that 10-year hedge growth is far too long and will make Frodsham look like an eyesore.	<b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> sets out conservative assumptions on planting growth rates that have been considered as part of the assessment of effects. The typical plant species proposed are all native species suited to the local landscape, as set out in the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
FS2_OFF_066	Respondent cited the need for the project to visually appeal to drive support for net zero targets nationally.	The Applicant notes this comment. The design approach is set out within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> – the Applicant

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		considers that it has responded to the local landscape character.
FS2_OFF_066	Respondent stated that screening should be curved as opposed to straight hedgerows.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_066	Respondent suggested hiring a specialist in aesthetics to make the solar farm look more appealing.	The Applicant notes this comment. The design approach is set out within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> .
FS2_FF_012	Respondent stated that the sandstone ridge trust has been working to have the area designated one of outstanding natural beauty which would attract tourists to the area.	The Applicant is aware of the aspiration and ongoing work to support the designation of the 'Cheshire Sandstone Ridge National Landscape', which could extend to include Frodsham Hill and Helsby Hill to the east of the Site. <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> recognises the sensitivities of this area.
FS2_FF_015	Respondent stated particular interest in the new hedges growing natural to a full height/width.	The management of existing and proposed landscape elements is set out within and secured by the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
FS2_EF_006	<p>Respondent stated that the mock-up photo of the predicted view from Frodsham hill in Year 10 shows a completely different unattractive perspective to the current view. The reasons are clear to see on Fig 2.3a of the PEIR in that the central southerly front section of the array has no screening planned.</p> <p>The responded comments that there is virtually no screening planned for the largest western section of the array which is on higher land, and notes that they consider it unclear as to what the anticipated maximum heights of the proposed four types of screening would be.</p>	<p><b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> includes an assessment from elevated positions including at Frodsham Hill and Helsby Hill and concludes that visual effects would not be significant. Mitigation measures such as planting for screening would not be effective given the change in elevation.</p> <p>More generally, screening planting has been proposed in a manner to ensure that impacts are mitigated as far as possible.</p>



Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		<p><b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> sets out conservative assumptions in Section 6.3 for planting growth rates, and these have been considered as part of the assessment of effects.</p>
FS2_EF_006	<p>Respondent cited a comparison of Fig 2.3a: PEIR (Illustrative Landscape Master Plan) with Fig 2.4: PEIR (Rights of Way, Permissive and Other Recreational Routes) shows that a high proportion of the new permissive paths pass through a large swathe of 11' high solar panels with no or minimal screening by planting shrubs and trees on either side. The respondent added that such passages would be very monotonous and discourage recreational use. A much more attractive model would be to include a semi- continuous screen of shrubs &amp; trees with occasional open areas providing long distance vistas.</p> <p>Respondent concluded that it is not possible for residents to envisage these prospects as there is no Figure in the PEIR, which overlays the planned proposed trees, shrubs and woodland onto a map showing the new permissive paths nor could I detect any photographic mock-ups. Adding that a much better 3D visualisation process is required and that used by kitchen designers would help enormously or alternatively provide a scale 3D model.</p>	<p>The Approach to design of recreational routes is set out within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Vol 3 Figure 2-3: Illustrative Environmental Masterplan [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b> shows the planned arrangement of the permissive paths alongside proposed landscape elements. The permissive paths cross a variety of landscape features giving access to previously inaccessible areas of the Site. Some, such as the paths in the eastern part of the Site lie on topographic features giving more opportunity for longer distance views towards the estuary and back towards the sandstone ridge, others e.g. in the north eastern part of the Site, run adjacent to the River Weaver and Manchester Ship Canal giving a new perspective on the river and the Estuary, previously unavailable – vast open views are available from these lengths of path. The</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		<p>permissive paths in the central area of the Site include very substantial landscaped corridors to allow users to enjoy access in new areas of the Site.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment regarding 3D modelling. The Applicant does not intend to produce 3D visualisations for Proposed Development. The Applicant has developed a number of photomontages, including how the Proposed Development will look from a number of viewpoints, which are contained within <b>ES Volume 3 [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b>.</p>
FS2_OFF_065	Respondent stated that Frodsham solar must care for the landscape and the views of local residents as it will shape their opinion of solar power and other renewable energy.	The Applicant notes this comment.
<b>Traffic, Transport and Access</b>		
FS2_OFF_012	Respondent expressed concern about the project's impact on increased traffic during construction.	<p>The impacts of construction traffic are assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment [EN010153/DR/7.3]</b>. The assessment concludes that there would be no significant residual adverse traffic effects, with residual impacts on traffic flows, road safety, and amenity assessed as negligible to minor adverse.</p>
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent cited issues regarding fly-tipping in the area, specifically the Moorditch Lane car park.	<p>The <b>outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.6]</b> includes for monitoring of anti-social behaviour in consultation with Cheshire Constabulary.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_FF_007	Respondent stated that existing roads over the farmland to the proposed solar area is not good and Cubico need to understand this and may require extensive work.	The Applicant has reviewed the access to the Site, which is provided, in part, by the existing access tracks to Frodsham Wind Farm. <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> recognises that the condition of these will need to be improved prior to construction. This is likely to involve filling potholes and improving surfacing with additional aggregate.
FS2_FF_010	Respondents stated that construction traffic must not be allowed to divert through Helsby and Frodsham.	Construction traffic will not run through Frodsham or Helsby.  The proposed construction traffic access routes are described in the <b>Transport Assessment [EN010153/DR/7.3]</b> . The routing of construction traffic avoiding the villages is secured by the commitments made in the <b>outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010153/DR7.4]</b> .

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_EF_010	A respondent has expressed concern that the traffic impacts could be increased if HyNet and Frodsham Solar is constructing at the same time.	<p>The <b>Transport Assessment [EN010153/DR/7.3]</b> includes a cumulative assessment that considers other committed developments that could be under construction in the area concurrently as the Proposed Development. This includes potential construction traffic from the HyNet North West project and ongoing developments at Protos (Ince) Energy Park. These projects, if built in overlapping timeframes, could generate additional HGV traffic on the same road links as the Proposed Development. The TA assumes a conservative case where peak construction of Frodsham Solar coincides with peak construction traffic from other committed developments in 2028.</p> <p>The cumulative assessment concludes that there would be no severe residual cumulative impact on the road network from the Proposed Development together with other projects. While traffic from the different projects will temporarily increase flows on certain routes, the assessment finds the network can handle the combined traffic with only minor increases in delays.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_EF_010	A respondent objects to the project using Marsh Lane, Moorditch Lane and Lordship Lane as access points during both construction and thereafter, due to the width of the single track and feasibility of existing businesses being able to operate at full capacity without any losses incurred as a result of Frodsham Solar's construction and operation.	<p>The project is proposing to use the same access route as Frodsham Wind Farm for the purposes of construction. An <b>outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.4]</b> has been provided, which describes how traffic would be managed throughout the construction period. The <b>outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.5]</b> includes provision for liaising with local businesses throughout the construction period via the Community Liaison Officer and an opportunity for membership to the Community Liaison Group.</p> <p>There would be no use of Moorditch Lane or the southern end of Brook Furlong for construction traffic to access the Site from Frodsham, as set out in the <b>Transport Assessment [EN010153/DR/7.3]</b>.</p>
<b>Soils &amp; agriculture</b>		
FS2_OFF_034	Respondent expressed concern about the use of agricultural land.	<p><b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 3-1: Alternative Site Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b> provides justification as to why there are no alternative sites or areas that offer a realistic prospect of delivering the same infrastructure capacity within the same timescales as that proposed by the Applicant. Accordingly, the use of agricultural land is justified.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_038, FS2_OFF_052	Respondents believe classification of land is wrong.	The Applicant has undertaken an Agricultural Land Classification survey (prepared by Reading Agricultural Consultants) for the Site that has established the land is predominantly grade 4, with some areas of grade 3b land in the west. The results of this survey can be found at Appendix 17.2 of <b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 1-1: Frodsham Solar Scoping Report [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b> . The agricultural potential of the land is limited by the dredging deposit grounds in the west, and flooding in the east.
<b>Hydrology, flooding &amp; drainage</b>		
FS2_OFF_026	Respondent suggested that all pathways should be ensured that they are kept open at all times of the year, considering the wet nature of the land.	The Proposed Development includes permeable stone surfacing for access roads and pathways to ensure year-round usability, even in wet conditions ( <b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 9-1, [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b> ). The design accounts for flood resilience, with critical infrastructure elevated above flood levels (6.49m AOD, providing 600mm freeboard above extreme flood scenarios). Additionally, the Flood Warning & Evacuation Plan (included in the same appendix) ensures operational protocols for maintaining access during adverse weather.



Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_037	Respondent would like to know about the mitigation for flood risk when the ground is being covered up. And if damaged by weather, what would leak into the ground.	The solar arrays are spaced to allow natural rainwater infiltration, minimizing runoff ( <b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 9-1</b> ). The BESS includes impermeable liners and a contained firewater lagoon to prevent contamination ( <b>[EN010153/DR/7.8]</b> ). Strict spill controls (drip trays, spill kits) are enforced during construction ( <b>oCEMP, [EN010153/DR/7.5]</b> ). If severe weather damages infrastructure, emergency protocols isolate affected areas and prevent groundwater pollution ( <b>oOEMP, [EN010153/DR/7.6]</b> ).
FS2_OFF_037	Respondent stated that they would like to know what happens if the solar farm is damaged by bad weather.	Critical electrical components are elevated to 6.49m AOD ( <b>Table 9-12</b> ), with solar modules raised 1.5m above ground, allowing flood-vulnerable sections to be isolated. The system can be remotely deactivated during severe weather ( <b>oOEMP [EN010153/DR/7.6]</b> ). Post-event, there would be damaged equipment undergoes safety inspections and cleaning before reconnection (supported by regular maintenance and insurance for rapid repairs).
Public Rights of Way		

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_003, FS2_OFF_021, FS2_OFF_026, FS2_OFF_038	<p>Respondents support the permissive footpaths proposed.</p> <p>A respondent stated that the new permissive paths will allow for the observation of the ponds in the area currently inaccessible.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to delivering a series of permissive paths across the site. This is described within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> and the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b>. The delivery of these paths is secured via the requirements set out in Schedule 1 of the <b>Draft Development Consent Order [EN010153/DR/3.1]</b>.</p> <p>The indicative route of the permissive paths is shown on Illustrative Environmental Masterplan contained in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b>. This includes a potential viewing point over the Non-Breeding Bird Mitigation Area which would facilitate improved access to viewing of birdlife.</p>
FS2_OFF_029, FS2_OFF_039, FS2_FF_014	Respondents requested that the proposed permissive paths in the Western area are made accessible for cycles to allow for circular routes around the marshes and no dead ends.	<p>The permissive paths have been designed to include access by cyclists. One of the design outcomes is a hierarchy of routes through the Order Limits, including a series of 'loops' that can be accessed by multiple user groups. The permissive paths are illustrated on the Illustrative Environmental Masterplan contained in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b>. <b>ES Vol</b></p>
FS2_OFF_003, FS2_OFF_008, FS2_OFF_021, FS2_OFF_026, FS2_OFF_064, FS2_EF_006	<p>Respondents support the preservation of the rights of way and believes it needs to be maintained.</p> <p>Respondents have asked that NCN5 is upgraded and maintained.</p> <p>A respondent stated that all paths must be maintained to ensure vegetation does not encroach onto walking routes.</p>	

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_FF_009, FS2_OFF_026, FS2_OFF_054	<p>A respondent suggested installing benches and blinds to enhance path user experience, especially at significant viewpoints.</p> <p>A respondent requested suitable seating with back rests and arm supports along the new permissive paths at points such as viewpoints, with bird screen features accessible to all age groups.</p>	<b>3 Figure 2-4: Existing and Proposed PRow and Permissive Paths [EN010153/DR/6.3]</b> shows how the proposed permissive paths link with existing PROW to deliver a series of circular routes across the Site.
FS2_OFF_042, FS2_OFF_053	<p>Respondent suggested that there should be improvements to the current national cycle routes.</p> <p>Respondent suggested upgrades for footpaths, gates fences and signage.</p>	<p>The <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> describes how the paths across the Site would be maintained. Section 5.0 of the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.9]</b> describes that during the operational phase, all public rights of way and permissive routes within the Order Limits would be maintained, to allow access to occur without impediment. The project would improve the surfacing of the section of the NCN5 that lies within the Order Limits at the end of the construction period. However, the Applicant is not in control of the vehicular users along the NCN5 and so would not be in control of its condition in the longer term.</p>
FS2_OFF_021	Respondent stated that the omission of cycling routes in the designation of the proposed and existing footpaths is a serious oversight.	
FS2_OFF_025	Respondent asked if any measures are being put in place to prevent anti-social behaviour on the new/proposed footpaths such as quad bikes.	The Applicant is proposing to provide benches at strategic locations across the Site. This (and the ongoing measures for management of the Applicant's access proposals) is set out in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . The final location and design will be subject to the detailed design which is secured via the

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		requirements set out in Schedule 1 of the <b>Draft Development Consent Order [EN010153/DR/3.1]</b> .
FS2_OFF_026	Respondent requested that Public Rights of Way are kept open, where this can safely be achieved. The respondent added that any short-term temporary closures are in place through having a TRO in place with displays on sites.	Site security will be part of the detailed design process and consideration of measures to restrict antisocial behaviour will form part of this process. This is set out in the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . The <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.9]</b> sets out the measures that will be adopted to maintain access across the Site during the construction period
FS2_FF_002, FS2_EF_006	Respondent expressed disappointment that plans do not consider access routes for cycle ways.  Respondents requested that all permissive paths are accessible for all walkers, equestrians, cyclists, and wheelchairs.	The <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.9]</b> sets out the measures that will be adopted to maintain access across the Site during the construction period. The measures set out seek to minimise the need for temporary closures during the construction periods. Section 5.3 and 5.4 of <b>the Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> discusses that the design approach to the additional permissive path connections being provided be the Applicant. It describes how the design has been refined following community feedback to provide a hierarchy of paths for different user groups including walkers, equestrians, cyclists and wheelchair users.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_026	Respondent noted confusion in documents between permissive paths and permissive footpaths.	The Applicant has clarified this within the application documents. The permissive paths through the Site will be capable of being accessed by multiple user groups, with certain paths restricted to certain user groups to cater for all requirements.
FS2_OFF_026	Respondent requested new paths be created which keeps this division across the site for different users, maintaining eastern paths exclusively for the use of walkers.	The permissive paths through the Site will be capable of being accessed by multiple user groups, with certain paths restricted to certain user groups to cater for all requirements.
FS2_OFF_026	Respondent requested the number of access structures on footpaths be kept to a minimum.	The permissive paths will be designed to avoid limitations to access but will also need to be designed to ensure adequate security to prevent antisocial behaviour on the Site.
FS2_OFF_026	Respondent suggested improving public rights of way within the wider Frodsham and Elton parishes (e.g. through a ring-fenced donation to the Peak & Northern Footpath Society, which works with Cheshire West to correct faults on the PROW network).	The Applicant is not proposing to improve PROW outside the Order Limits. Throughout the community consultation, the Applicant has made the community aware that there will be funding available through the project that can be used to finance community projects. This could include works to PROW in the local area.
FS2_OFF_026	Respondent stated if path widths are not currently recorded in the Definitive Statement, then they would expect 'accepted good practice' widths to be maintained for all public rights of way allowing two users to pass each other.	Subject to any engineering or topographic limitations, the permissive paths would be designed in accordance with good practice.
FS2_OFF_034	Respondent stated that there will be a loss of amenity for local residents as a walking area.	The Applicant is maintaining all of the existing PROW across the Site and providing a network of new paths to increase access and amenity. The design of the project includes provision of generous buffers along existing PROW and

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		carefully designed landscaping to screen development in certain locations and retain longer distance views others.
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that they would like assurances that the DCO will legally secure the use of permissive paths and maintenance for the full operational period.	The Applicant is committed to delivering a series of permissive paths across the site. This is described within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> and the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . The delivery and maintenance of these paths is secured via the requirements set out in Schedule 2 of the <b>Draft Development Consent Order [EN010153/DR/3.1]</b> .
FS2_OFF_056	Respondent stated that access should be made available so locals can view Frodsham marshes.	The indicative route of the permissive paths is shown on Illustrative Environmental Masterplan contained in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . This includes a potential viewing points and provision of interpretation material to enhance users experience of the Site.
FS2_OFF_063	Respondent stated that proposed right of way around no.1 tank is essential.	The indicative route of the permissive paths is shown on Illustrative Environmental Masterplan contained in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . This includes a route around Cell 1 and adjacent to Cell 3.
FS2_OFF_063	Respondent stated that defined footpaths re vague along the south of no.3 tank.	
FS2_FF_001	Respondent suggested a public right of way surrounding the non-breeding bird mitigation area, specifically along the canal side.	A permissive path and viewing point are proposed to the east of Cell 3 NBBMA. Additional routes adjacent to or within the NBBMA have been

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		excluded in order to avoid disturbance to the birds which the area is designed to provide mitigation habitat for.
FS2_FF_015	Respondent stated initial concerns regarding retaining access along the top of the bank when approaching this point. The respondent supports the retention of this land.	The Applicant is unclear on the point made by the respondent. However, other responses clarify the extensive provision being made for enhanced access across the Site.
FS2_OFF_025,	Respondent supports the proposals of footpaths along the ship canals.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_EF_006	Respondent stated that the Phase 2 proposals appear to discriminate against disabled residents and horse riders noting that: a. A 2021 survey of Cheshire West's residents "identified as 17.9% as being disabled and 7.4% as being limited a lot". <a href="https://www.ons.gov.uk/visualisations/censusareachanges/E06000050/">https://www.ons.gov.uk/visualisations/censusareachanges/E06000050/</a> b. The British Equestrian's 2023 report states that there 1.8m regular riders which represents approx. 2.6 % residents. Note that: The Sport England-supported Together Fund continued to help centres across England to encourage growth and engagement in physical activity.	One of the design outcomes for the Proposed Development is a hierarchy of routes through the Order Limits, including a series of 'loops' that can be accessed by multiple user groups. The permissive paths include access for disabled residents and horse riders.
FS2_OFF_030	Respondent suggested separate cycle bridges to allow cyclists to bypass the very dangerous Sutton Causeway would be fantastic.	The comment is noted. However, the Sutton Causeway falls outside the Order Limits and so this has not been provided.
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that the PEIR references enhancements to the existing public rights of way but wants clarification on the term 'where feasible' asking where it would not be feasible.	The Applicant is committed to delivering a series of permissive paths across the site. This is described within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8]</b> and the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . The delivery of these paths is secured via the requirements set out in Schedule 2 of the <b>Draft Development Consent Order [EN010153/DR/3.1]</b> .



Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that the design of the permissive paths should be inclusive and compliant with design guidance such as the Environment Agency's access for all design guide or "Outdoor Access Design Guide" by Paths for All.	The guidance described has been considered within the development of the permissive paths. Paragraph 6.5.18 of the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> describes that the permissive paths will be designed with regard to the EA guidance document, along with other access design guides from the Sustrans and Scottish Natural Heritage.
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent noted potential difficulties in narrow areas, boggy areas, and level changes need particular attention, for example a) FP91 (connections at both ends, to RB99/RB10 at south, and FP91/new permissive path along river at north end), b) connection of FP81 to new permissive path at south corner of INEOS Inovyn deposit ground, and c) end of FP81 (south of M56) low area which floods between motorway bridge and Ship Street). Avoidance of any barriers along the paths (gates, stiles etc) or if this cannot be avoided ensure designed inclusively for all users. The respondent added that cycling routes also need to be inclusive for people using non-standard or adapted cycles.	One of the design outcomes is a hierarchy of routes through the Order Limits, including a series of 'loops' that can be accessed by multiple user groups. The permissive paths are illustrated on the Illustrative Environmental Masterplan contained in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> . Section 5.0 of the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.9]</b> describes how public rights of way and permissive routes will be maintained throughout the duration of the project.
<b>Community benefits &amp; impact</b>		
FS2_OFF_012, FS2_OFF_014, FS2_EF_003, FS2_FF_012, FS2_EF_006	Respondents believe community benefit package is too small.  One respondent suggested that the annual fund should be £600,000.	Further details on the Community Benefit Fund have been provided within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010153/DR/5.6]</b> but noting that this is not matter relevant for the planning balance.
FS2_OFF_028	Respondent supports the initiatives presented, namely Fuel, Community, and Employment & Skills Funding.	The Applicant notes this comment.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_007, FS2_OFF_014, FS2_EF_003	Respondents believes that the community fund should be spent mitigating the eyesore of the solar farm.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_031, FS2_FF_004, FS2_FF_009	Respondents suggested environmental community funding.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_017, FS2_OFF_018	Respondents stated that 'we' do not need the money in community benefit.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_019	Respondent stated that any community benefits proposed are preferable to the waste of money on solar installations.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_044, FS2_OFF_045, FS2_OFF_046, FS2_OFF_047, FS2_OFF_048, FS2_OFF_049, FS2_OFF_050, FS2_EF_004	Respondents suggested supporting the fundraising for developing a new boathouse for the Runcorn Rowing club.	<p>The Applicant would like to thank all respondents for providing background information and suggestions on the potential options for Frodsham Solar's Community Benefit Fund.</p> <p>If consented, the solar farm could be built and fully operational by 2030. At that point, the Project starts generating the revenue that will support the funding of Community Benefits.</p> <p>The fund will be available from the start of operation of the project and is an annual fund throughout the lifetime of the project. The fund will be index-linked.</p> <p>In advance of that, the Applicant intends to engage a third-party organisation which specialises in the management of community funds. It is expected that the organisation will</p>
FS2_OFF_011, FS2_OFF_024	Respondents suggested committing to a certain number of local labour and potentially an apprenticeship programme. This includes opportunities for young people in terms of sport, health and vocational training opportunities.	
FS2_OFF_001, FS2_OFF_031,	Respondents suggested community funding should go towards Fuel Funding – In partnership with organisations and charities focused on providing financial support to households living in fuel poverty	
FS2_OFF_038, FS2_OFF_039	Respondents stated that the people of Frodsham should determine the community benefit allocation.	
FS2_OFF_027, FS2_FF_015	Respondents suggested investment in youth groups/programmes. This includes uniformed groups such as Scouts and Guides.	

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_053, FS2_OFF_065	Respondents requested an educational element aimed at primary schools and Helsby High School.	<p>launch a dedicated consultation on the types of initiatives that the Frodsham Solar farm should support. The feedback we have received to date, as part of our own pre-application consultation - including these comments, will feed into that analysis.</p> <p>Therefore, the Applicant thanks all respondents for providing feedback on what the Community Benefit Fund should look like. The Applicant will ensure this feedback is considered in subsequent consultations, and advises respondents, interested groups, and all residents to engage on the subject further when the project is more advanced.</p>
FS2_OFF_003, FS2_OFF_061, FS2_OFF_063, FS2_OFF_064, FS2_OFF_065	Respondents stated that money should be spent on wildlife mitigation and open spaces for local residents.  A respondent requested the construction and maintenance of a bird hide.	
FS2_FF_006, FS2_FF_014	Respondents suggested development funding for leisure such as cycling/walking.	
FS2_OFF_002	Respondent suggested improvements to Disability Access.  This includes disability access to Helsby and Frodsham Train Stations.	
FS2_OFF_006	Respondent believes that local people should receive a cheque each year instead of a central fund.	
FS2_OFF_008	Respondent would like to see more funding for community health and well-being.	
FS2_OFF_010	Respondent suggested supporting local charities/non-profit organisations.	
FS2_OFF_011	Respondent suggested a grant to Frodsham Town Council to reduce residents' costs towards local government.	
FS2_OFF_011	Respondent suggested ring fencing a certain amount to support the CWaCC electric bus for the community for additional years beyond the existing pilot scheme or fund alternative connectivity schemes without increasing the carbon footprint.	
FS2_OFF_016	Respondent stated that people in Halton are also impacted by the solar farm so the benefits should not just be focused on Frodsham.	
FS2_OFF_025	Respondent suggested a funding initiative for residents of Frodsham and Helsby to install solar panels on their properties.	

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_033	Respondent stated that the funding should go towards improving insulation on low income and social housing to reduce energy use and expense.	
FS2_OFF_034	Respondent suggested outdoor recreation opportunities.	
FS2_OFF_052	Respondent suggested maintenance and monitoring of the local ecology. The respondent added that the Mersey Gateway Environmental trust is a decent model that should be reported.	
FS2_OFF_053	Respondent stated that funding should be set aside for Frodsham Community Centre.	
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent requested that applications should be allowed every year as community needs may change.	
FS2_OFF_055	Respondent stated that the funding needs to be guaranteed for the entire operational and decommissioning period of the installation.	
FS2_OFF_055	Respondent stated that the funding basis should be explained clearly and justified by transparent comparison with past, present and anticipated future base line values, and those provided by other installation operators across the UK.	
FS2_OFF_058	Respondent stated that maintenance and development of the breeding and non-breeding areas of birds.	
FS2_OFF_060	Respondent stated that no community benefit options compensate for the loss of bird habitat.	
FS2_OFF_066	Respondent stated that the project should complement rather than duplicate what support the government gives.	
FS2_OFF_066	Respondent states that the fund should help insulate homes.	
FS2_FF_001, FS2_FF_002	Respondent suggested that a bidding/application system should be in place to ensure all community groups can access funds.	
FS2_FF_007	Respondent stated that community funding is provided fairly well by the peel windfarm. The respondent stated that the funding should be used for long term employment skill development.	

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_FF_010	Respondent stated that as the proposed development is also in the Helsby district, the fund should not be named the Frodsham Community Fund.	
FS2_OFF_012,	Respondent suggested spending community benefit on improving road infrastructure.	
FS2_OFF_036,	Respondent suggested a community owned farming project or eco farming scheme.	
FS2_FF_002,	Respondent suggested the creation of a visitor information centre,	
FS2_EF_006	Respondent stated that no mention is made of introducing a bike skills course.  An equivalent provision could be achieved by providing cycle routes which are segregated from footpaths and make use of embankments to offer a variety of topography	
FS2_EF_036	Respondent stated that they would love to see more community-owned farming and eco projects.	
Socioeconomics, tourism & recreation		
FS2_OFF_010	Respondent stated that solar energy is expensive, and this will only contribute to the issue of expensive energy bills in the UK.	The project is fully aligned with the Government's vision of a modernised, resilient power system as outlined in the British Energy Security Strategy and the Energy Security Plan. By delivering secure, low-cost renewable power, the Proposed Development will strengthen energy independence and protect consumers and businesses from future energy price shocks.
FS2_FF_006	Respondent stated that educational opportunities and socio-economic factors that benefit the local community are welcome.	An <b>Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [EN010153/DR/7.11]</b> has been

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_055	Respondent stated that there should be a clear commitment to the benefit and use of local industry and suppliers during the construction phase of the installation with clear and transparent process for doing so and ensuring fair treatment for local businesses and labour.	prepared, which sets out how the Applicant is committed to developing opportunities and mechanisms to provide educational opportunities for the local community. The plan also identifies how opportunities for targeted local recruitment (including under-represented groups) and business-support and procurement measures would be developed so local SMEs can bid for work. The plan commits the developer and its contractors to modern slavery due diligence, fair-work policies and transparent supply-chain reporting.
FS2_OFF_036	Respondent asked if the project would employ unionised workers to design, construct and maintain the site.	
Noise & vibration		
FS2_FF_010	Respondent stated that there should be no noise problem.	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and commits to delivering a low level of noise as part of construction and operation.</p> <p>A noise assessment has been undertaken within <b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 4-1 Noise Impact Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b>. The assessment concludes there would be no significant impacts at residential properties. The <b>outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.5]</b> includes a requirement for the contractor to prepare a Construction Noise Management Plan (CNMP) and describes a series of measures that would be used to minimise construction noise effects.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
<b>Consultation &amp; engagement</b>		
FS2_EF_001, FS2_FF_012	Respondents stated that they do not have faith in the consultation process. The respondent stated that the assertion from previous consultations that over 50% of respondents were in favour is incorrect.	<p>Consultation undertaken on the Project has complied with relevant requirements and legislation, and the commitments and principles established in the Applicant's SoCC, available to view in <b>Appendix 2: Statement of Community Consultation Materials [EN010153/DR/5.2]</b>.</p> <p>There was no assertion by the Applicant that over 50% of respondents were in favour of the proposals. The Applicant notes that at the first phase of consultation, 53 out of the 190 respondents who answered the question 'What are your views on our initial proposals for Frodsham Solar?' in the feedback form selected that they support the proposals, which was the single most popular answer selected. This is stated within the Phase One Consultation Summary Report (<b>Appendix 4: Phase One Consultation Summary Report [EN010153/DR/5.2]</b>).</p>



Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_EF_001	Respondent believes that the consultation has been inadequate.	<p>Chapter 2 to the Consultation Report describes how the Applicant's consultation has complied with relevant legislation and associated guidance. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section _ (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>A consultation period of 43 days was provided for responses to the PEIR and phase two consultation information, exceeding the statutory requirement of 28 days. To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. This included notifying over 11,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at public information events and by request to the Project</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
		communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.
FS2_EF_002	Respondent believes there should be an independent adjudicator. The respondent added that if there is not then the consultation is void.	Due to the project meeting the criteria to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), the Development Consent Order (DCO) application will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). The Planning inspectorate is an independent government agency which will adjudicate on the application and examination. The final decision on whether the project is approved will be the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero.
FS2_FF_006	Respondent stated that the design considerations of the consultation leaflet are excellent and should enhance/benefit the area whilst mitigating potential problems.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_FF_012	Respondent stated that many of the contentious issues have been addressed, but the visual impact cannot be mitigated.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_FF_015	Respondent stated that they appreciate how the updated proposals as laid out is a good compromise.	The Applicant notes this comment.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_036,	Respondent stated they struggled to read and digest the PIER.	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The PEIR non-technical summary (NTS), which included a summary of EIA matters, were available to all attendees at the phase two consultation information events, on the Project website, and at Community Access Point sites as detailed in the SoCC. It remains accessible on the project website.</p> <p>The Applicant also produced a Community Consultation Leaflet at both phases of consultation to allow anyone interested in the project to read a community-facing document about the project, including maps of the project.</p>
FS2_FF_013	Respondent stated they would like to see more extensive consultations with County and town councils.	<p>Local authorities, including Cheshire West and Chester Council and Halton Borough Council, as well as town and parish councils, including Frodsham Town Council and Helsby Parish Council have been invited to respond to both stages of consultation.</p> <p>Following Phase Two consultation, further engagement with Cheshire West and Chester Council and Frodsham Town Council has been undertaken, regarding the design of the project, which has been used to further refine the project.</p>
FS2_OFF_055	Respondent stated that there should be a commitment to a regular consultation with the local community and its representatives to get feedback of views and complaints about the installation's impact, suggesting 2 and 5 year consultation reviews.	The Applicant notes this comment.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
<b>Glint &amp; glare</b>		
FS2_OFF_006	Respondent expressed concern about the angle of the panels and sunlight being reflected on the motorway. (M56)	<p>During the preliminary design phase an iterative approach was taken to modelling glint and glare impacts to avoid impacts where possible, and where not possible, to reduce impacts to an acceptable level. The initial modelling identified potential impacts on road users of the M56, and so following consultation with National Highways, the azimuth angles and tilt angles of panels in the eastern extent of the Proposed Development have been changed to avoid or reduce the worst impacts.</p> <p><b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 4-3: Glint and Glare Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b> concludes that after implementing design and mitigation measures, the residual glint and glare impacts would be low for all relevant receptors.</p>
FS2_OFF_031	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of glint and glare from the top of Frodsham and Helsby hills.	<p>Glint and glare impacts are assessed within <b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 4-3 Glint and Glare Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b>. This includes an assessment from Frodsham War Memorial, which concludes that glint and glare impacts are not geometrically possible.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent stated that glint/glare mitigation is needed for dwellings in Ship Street Area.	<p>Landscape planting (hedgerows and trees) is proposed around the Site, which will progressively screen views of the panels. Specifically, this planting is located along the northern side of the M56 motorway to provide screening for road users, and residents to the south of the M56. This serves as mitigation for any residual glimpses of reflecting panels and is secured by the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b>.</p> <p>There are no residual likely significant adverse effects predicted in respect of glint and glare.</p>
FS2_FF_016	Respondent stated that the PEIR seems to only address the main flight paths/runway approaches for commercial fixed wing aircraft accessing Liverpool airport. The respondent added that there is considerable helicopter activity at low levels over Frodsham/Helsby marshes associated with both Liverpool and Hawarden airports. Respondent added that circuit flights of light aircraft also occur over the marshes frequently. The respondent added that the glint and glare assessment in the PEIR is revised to consider a broader range of air traffic over the marshes, not just relating to the Liverpool Airport flight path.	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Liverpool airport to address concerns regarding glint and glare. Any potential impact has been mitigated through changes to the design of the solar farm.</p> <p>Impact on Glint and Glare is appraised within ES Volume 2 Appendix 4-3 Glint and Glare Assessment <b>[EN010153/DR/6.2]</b>. This includes the use of the area by light aircraft.</p>
<b>Site selection &amp; alternatives</b>		
FS2_OFF_013, FS2_OFF_014, FS2_OFF_024, FS2_OFF_035, FS2_OFF_037, FS2_FF_012	<p>Respondents believe the space has too many projects planned and existing.</p> <p>This includes industrial use of the land, the wind farm, the proposed pipeline and the proposed solar farm.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Environmental Statement <b>[EN010153/DR/6.1 / 6.2 / 6.3]</b> provides an inter project assessment of the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development in combination with other consented or emerging developments.</p>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_035, FS2_OFF_038	Respondents expressed an opinion that site is unsuitable.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_006	Respondent believes the site is suitable for the proposals. This is a result of the site being wasteland, low value, well connected to the grid, and a better alternative to prime farming land.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_018	Respondent asked why the solar farm was placed directly in front of Frodsham when there is a perfectly good space on the marshes between Frodsham and Helsby that would impact on nobody.	<b>ES Vol 2 Appendix 3-1: Alternative Site Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2]</b> provides justification as to why there are no alternative sites or areas that offer a realistic prospect of delivering the same infrastructure capacity within the same timescales as that proposed by the Applicant.
FS2_OFF_023	Respondent asked why not consider tidal energy on the edge of the Merseyside?	As set out in Section 2.0 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010153/DR/5.6]</b> , Government has identified that there is a critical need for various types of renewable and low carbon energy, including solar. The Applicant is applying for a solar development to meet this established need.
FS2_OFF_053	Respondent stated that the substation needs to be located in central location and away from the Skylark Mitigation Area.	The <b>Environmental Statement [EN010153/DR/6.1 / 6.2 / 6.3]</b> has assessed both potential substation / BESS options and concluded that either option would be suitable. A decision on the final location will be taken at the detailed design stage, post consent. The Skylark Mitigation Area would not be impacted by the presence of Frodsham Substation. The substation does not have frequently moving components and would not generate noise which is materially higher than background noise levels given the existing background noise levels from, amongst other sources, the M56.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_055	Respondent stated that an analysis of the interaction between the wind installation and proposed Solar farm on birds and other flora and fauna should be performed in order to establish whether the combined effects are more harmful or intrusive than each individual installation.	The Frodsham Wind Farm is established and operational, and therefore forms part of the baseline conditions that have informed the assessment of the Proposed Development contained within <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 7: Terrestrial Ecology [EM010153/DR/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> .
<b>Construction &amp; decommissioning</b>		
FS2_OFF_005, FS2_OFF_018, FS2_OFF_023	Respondent believes that the environmental impact of construction and decommissioning will negate the positive environmental benefits of the project.	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The impacts of the construction and decommissioning phases have been considered as part of the assessment of environmental effects provided in the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010153/DR/6.1 / 6.2 / 6.3]</b> and appropriate mitigation measures have been introduced in the management plans submitted with the application. In particular it is noted that Chapter 5: Climate Change demonstrates that the operational GHG benefits of the operational phase significantly outweigh construction and decommissioning emissions.</p>
FS2_OFF_011	Respondent requested the proposed footpaths and cycle routes be implemented prior to construction in case construction costs overrun.	The construction phasing of the Proposed Development is outlined in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> . The enhancements to recreational access are legally secured by requirements of the <b>draft DCO [EN010153/DR/3.1]</b> .



May 2021

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_055	Respondent stated that there should be a duty of care decommissioning agreement that the installation will be removed, and the area restored in keeping with the bird, wildlife and human beings proposed by the installation and operational phases of the project.	The Proposed Development comprises a temporary development with an operational phase of up to 40 years. Decommissioning activities would therefore commence in 2069-2070, 40 years after final commissioning. This decommissioning period is secured by a requirement of the <b>draft DCO [EN010153/DR/3.1]</b> . The <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.7]</b> . sets out the Applicant's commitments to decommissioning restoration and retention of planting.
FS2_FF_004	Respondent asked if the solar farm could have a 'dismantle date'. E.g. The project will be standing for 10 years then removed. The respondent added that it might get more people in favour and protect nature.	
Project description & DCO Process		
FS2_OFF_001, FS2_OFF_002, FS2_OFF_004, FS2_OFF_041, FS2_OFF_042, FS2_OFF_044, FS2_OFF_046, FS2_OFF_047, FS2_OFF_065, FS2_FF_011	Respondents expressed general support for the project	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_018, FS2_OFF_033	Respondents expressed general opposition to the project.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_OFF_055	Respondent stated that there must be a clear commitment in the event that Cubico diverts from the installation, or the solar farm is bought that the commitments made in the proposal are honoured and cannot be derogated from, including construction, maintenance, local funding and decommissioning.	The commitments made are secured by the <b>draft DCO [EN010153/DR/3.1]</b> which if granted forms a statutory legal document, breach of which is a criminal offence by any party that is the undertaker at the time the breach occurs.

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_057	Respondent stated that previous permission for development and installation of the nearby wind farm resulted in failure within the agreement in allowing and maintaining an area for wading birds to roost over hightide of the Mersey. The respondent added that the local farmer continued to allow cattle and sheep in the area destroying the natural habitats of many amber listed birds.	The Applicant acknowledges existing mitigation measures implemented for the Frodsham Wind Farm and confirms that the NBBMA will provide additional and enhanced mitigation. Section 8.7 of <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 8: Ornithology [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b> describes how the NBBMA builds upon previous measures by incorporating features such as prolonged wet periods and predator control. Furthermore, the NBBMA will be managed independently to ensure long-term delivery and maintenance, as outlined in Appendix B of the <b>outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010153/DR/7.13]</b> .
FS2_FF_004, FS2_EF_003	Respondent requested greater clarity from Cubico regarding the source of funding during the project (Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan and PSP Investments). The respondent added they feel uncertainty about the project being for mid-term money creation.	The Applicant, through being a Cubico subsidiary, has the ability to fund the Proposed Development. This is set out in the Funding Statement <b>[EN010153/DR/4.2]</b>
FS2_EF_011	A respondent objects to the creation of a car park from Marsh Lane.	The Applicant notes this comment.
FS2_EF_010	Respondent believes the main aim of the project is to make profits.	The energy sector in the UK is privatised and relies on private investment to operate and maintain. The Proposed Development is commercially viable and will deliver substantial public benefits. The need for the project is well established, as set out in Section 2.0 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010153/DR/5.6]</b> .
FS2_OFF_036	Respondent asked if the company would prioritise buying British and European products for the purpose of the project.	The Applicant's commitments to the supply chain (and which will ultimately be approved by the local planning authority pursuant to DCO Requirement) are set out in the <b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010153/DR/7.11]</b>

Feedback ID	Comment	Applicant Response
FS2_OFF_054	Respondent asked if security features like cameras and gates will be employed at the potential Moorditch Lane car park.	<p>As set out in <b>ES Vol 1 Chapter 2: The Proposed Development [EN010153/DR/6.1]</b>, the proposed visitor's car park would potentially be built if the recreational improvements proposed as part of Frodsham Solar increase the number of cars informally parking along Moorditch Lane and following agreement with the local community and CWaCC.</p> <p>Height barriers and a gate would be installed to secure the car park. If the car park leads to anti-social behaviour, such as fly-tipping, the operator would reserve the right to remove it.</p>
<b>Climate change &amp; energy need</b>		
FS2_OFF_053	Respondent expressed concern that project will not be effective tool in the fight against climate change with lack of sunlight and no production at night.	<p>The Proposed Development is technically feasible and commercially viable and will deliver substantial public benefits. The need for the project is well established, as set out in Section 2.0 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010153/DR/5.6]</b>. The Proposed Development will provide a timely and tangible boost to the UK's renewable capacity at the scale and speed required to help meet the country's net zero objectives.</p>
FS2_OFF_010	Respondent stated that solar power is not appropriate in the UK.	
FS2_OFF_017	Respondent stated that Net zero is not practical.	
FS2_OFF_023	Respondent stated that the project is the wrong investment for energy efficiency. The respondent added that not enough solar to be efficient in the North West.	
FS2_OFF_031	Respondent recognised the need for ground-mounted solar in achieving net-zero targets.	
		The Applicant notes this comment.