Fosse Green Energy

Fosse Green Energy

EN010154

9.3 Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations

Planning Act 2008 (as amended)

Regulation Rule 8(1)(k)

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

20 January 2026

VOLUME

9

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning

(Examination Procedure)

Rule 2010

Fosse Green Energy

Development Consent Order 202[ ]

9.3 Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations

Regulation Reference	Rule 8(1)(k)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	EN010154
Application Document Reference	EN010154/EXAM/9.3
Author	Fosse Green Energy Limited

Version	Date	Issue Purpose
Rev 1	20 January 2026	Deadline 1

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 7
1.1 Purpose of this document 7
1.2 Structure of this Document 7
2. Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations 23
2.1 Environment Agency 23
2.2 Network Rail Infrastructure Limited 42
2.3 Natural England 52
2.4 Historic England 61
2.5 Anglian Water Services 64
2.6 UK Health Security Agency 71
2.7 National Highways 73
2.8 National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) 90
2.9 The Coal Authority (The Mining Remediation Authority) 92
2.10 National Grid Electricity Distribution 93
3. Applicant's Responses to Local Authorities' Relevant Representations 94
3.1 North Kesteven District Council 94
3.2 Lincolnshire County Council 122
4. Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations 145
4.1 Thurlby Parish Council 145
4.2 Welbourn Parish Council 148
4.3 Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council 158
4.4 Coleby Parish Council 159
4.5 Haddington Parish Council 167
4.6 Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council 170
4.7 Norton Disney Parish Council 173
5. Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations 174
5.1 Springwell Solar Action 174
5.2 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust 178
5.3 Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group 180
5.4 British Pipeline Agency Ltd (Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd) 192
5.5 British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities 193
5.6 Cliff Villages Solar Action Group 200
5.7 Forestry Commission 201
5.8 Lincolnshire Against Needless Destruction 207
6. Applicant's Responses to People with an Interest in the Land's Relevant Representations 209

6.1 People with an Interest in the Land 209
7. Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations 245
7.1 General Public: Climate Change / Net Zero 245
7.2 General Public: Cultural Heritage 250
7.3 General Public: Ecology and Nature Conservation 255
7.4 General Public: Landscape and Visual Amenity 260
7.5 General Public: Noise and Vibration 265
7.6 General Public: Socio-Economics and Land Use 268
7.7 General Public: Traffic and Transport 278
7.8 General Public: Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage) 282
7.9 General Public: Other Environmental Topics 287
7.10 General Public: Cumulative Effects and Effect Interactions 294
7.11 General Public: Planning Policy 299
7.12 General Public: Site Selection 320
7.13 General Public: Proposed Development Design 327
7.14 General Public: Safety 335
7.15 General Public: The Applicant & Funding 342
7.16 General Public: Consultation and Engagement 353
7.17 General Public: Decommissioning 357
7.18 General Public: Public Rights of Way 362
7.19 General Public: Miscellaneous Comments 365

Tables

Table 1-1: List of Statutory Consultees who submitted Relevant Representations 10
Table 1-2: List of Local Authorities who submitted Relevant Representations 10
Table 1-3: List of Parish Councils who submitted Relevant Representations 10
Table 1-4: List of Non-Statutory Organisations who submitted Relevant Representations 11
Table 1-5: List of Persons with an Interest in the Land that submitted Relevant Representations 11
Table 1-6: List of Members of the General Public that submitted Relevant Representations 11
Table 1-7: Abbreviations 18
Table 2-1: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Environment Agency 23
Table 2-2: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Network Rail Infrastructure Limited 42
Table 2-3: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Natural England 52
Table 2-4: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Historic England 61

Table 2-5: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Anglian Water Services 64
Table 2-6: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: UK Health Security Agency 71
Table 2-7: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: National Highways (NH) 73
Table 2-8: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) 90
Table 2-9: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: The Coal Authority (The Mining Remediation Authority) 92
Table 2-10: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: National Grid Electricity Distribution 93
Table 3-1: Applicant's Responses to Local Authorities' Relevant Representations: North Kesteven District Council 94
Table 3-2: Applicant's Responses to Local Authorities' Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire County Council 122
Table 4-1: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Thurlby Parish Council 145
Table 4-2: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Welbourn Parish Council 148
Table 4-3: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council 158
Table 4-4: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Coleby Parish Council 159
Table 4-5: Applicant's Responses to Parish Council's Relevant Representations: Haddington Parish Council 167
Table 4-6: Applicant's Responses to Parish Council's Relevant Representations: Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council 170
Table 4-7: Applicant's Responses to Parish Council's Relevant Representations: Norton Disney Parish Council 173
Table 5-1: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Springwell Solar Action 174
Table 5-2: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust 178
Table 5-3: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group 180
Table 5-4: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: British Pipeline Agency Ltd (Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd) 192
Table 5-5: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities 193
Table 5-6: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Cliff Villages Solar Action Group 200
Table 5-7: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Forestry Commission 201
Table 5-8: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire Against Needless Destruction 207
Table 6-1: Applicant's Responses to People with an Interest in the Land's Relevant Representations 209
Table 7-1: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero 245

Table 7-2: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage 250
Table 7-3: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation 255
Table 7-4: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity 260
Table 7-5: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration 265
Table 7-6: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use 268
Table 7-7: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport 278
Table 7-8: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage) 282
Table 7-9: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics 287
Table 7-10: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions 294
Table 7-11: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy 299
Table 7-12: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection 320
Table 7-13: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design 327
Table 7-14: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Safety 335
Table 7-15: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding 342
Table 7-16: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement 353
Table 7-17: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning 357
Table 7-18: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way 362
Table 7-19: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments 365

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

1.1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Fosse Green Energy's ('the Applicant') response to the key issues raised in Relevant Representations (RRs) submitted by Interested Parties (IPs) in relation to Fosse Green Energy (the 'Proposed Development').

1.1.2 The Development Consent Order (DCO) application ('the DCO Application') for the Proposed Development was submitted on 18 July 2025 and accepted for Examination on 15 August 2025. The period during which IPs could submit RRs on the DCO Application ran from 26 September 2025 through to 27 October 2025, however that period was extended to 21 November 2025 for three parties which were not previously given the required 28 days' notice of the RR period. The RRs received were published on the Planning Inspectorate's project website on 03 November 2025. No RRs were received from the three parties that were the subject of the extended RR period.

1.1.3 A total of 292 responses were received during the RR period.

1.2 Structure of this Document

1.2.1 This report provides a response from the Applicant to the matters raised in the RRs and is structured as follows:

a. Table 2-1 – 2-10: Statutory Consultees: the Applicant's responses to relevant representations from Statutory Consultees, who are listed in Table 1-1 below.

b. Table 3-1 – 3-2: Local Authorities: the Applicant's responses to relevant representations from Local Authorities, who are listed in Table 1-2 below.

c. Table 4-1 – 4-7: Parish Councils: the Applicant's responses to relevant representations from Parish Councils, who are listed in Table 1-3 below.

d. Table 5-1 – 5-8: Non-Statutory Organisations: the Applicant's responses to relevant representations from Non-Statutory Organisations, who are listed in Table 1-4 below.

e. Table 6-1: Persons with an Interest in the Land: the Applicant's responses to relevant representations from Persons with Interest in the Land, who are listed in Table 1-5 below.

f. Table 7-1 – 7-11: General Public: the Applicant's responses to relevant representations from the General Public, organised into themes, who are listed in Table 1-6 below.

1.2.2 RRs received by Statutory Consultees, Local Authorities, Parish Councils, Non-Statutory Organisations and Persons with an Interest in the Land are presented as verbatim text taken from the Relevant Representations

submitted and are then responded to by setting out the Applicant's position on the matter at the time of writing.

1.2.3 To increase the conciseness of this document, similar points from the General Public have been grouped together by the theme of the RRs and summarised. The reference number column in the tables below refers to the reference given to the RRs in the Examination Library.

1.2.4 The documents submitted with the DCO Application are also referenced in this document, using the reference number given in the ExA's Examination Library (e.g. **[APP-XXX]**, or **[AS-XXX]**) where a document which has previously been submitted is referenced. All documents are also presented in numerical order in the Guide to the Application **[EN010154/EXAM/1.3]** (Rev 2).

Relevant representations with no response provided

1.2.5 The Applicant has not provided a response to RRs which relate to other schemes, or where an Interested Party has stated they object to the Proposed Development but have not provided the reason for the objection.

1.2.6 The following RRs do not relate to the Proposed Development but instead refer to other schemes; RR-005, RR-037, RR-061, RR-062, RR-165, RR-178. As such, a response has not been provided.

1.2.7 The following RRs stated an objection to the Proposed Development but did not provide details as to the reasons for their objection; RR-019, RR-049, RR-051, RR-063, RR-105, RR-109, RR-112, RR-180, RR-181, RR-193, RR-197, RR-212, RR-214, RR-219, RR-242, RR-254, RR-264, RR-266, RR-278, RR-282. The Applicant acknowledges these objections; however, a response has not been provided as the grounds for the objections have not been stated. Should further information in relation to these objectives be submitted at a later deadline, a response will be provided by the Applicant as appropriate.

Additional comments on the DCO Application submitted at Procedural Deadline A (30 December 2025)

1.2.8 Five members of the public made additional comments on the DCO Application by way of submissions at Procedural Deadline A (30 December 2025). The content of these additional submissions is similar to a number of submitted RRs by members of the public. The Applicant has therefore listed the Examination Library references for these additional submissions below and provided signposting to where these topics have been addressed within the responses to RRs.

1.2.9 PDA-007 – the points raised in this additional submission are addressed at:

a. Table 7-4, Theme: *Visual Impact of the Proposed Development*, Page 260;

b. Table 7-15, Theme: *Motive of Applicant*, Page 343, 344 and Page 347;

c. Table 7-12, Theme: *Preference for Alternative Sites for Solar Panels*, Page 322;

d. Table 7-3, Theme: *Impact on Wildlife Habitats*, Page 255; and

e. Table 7-6, Theme: *Use of Productive Agricultural Land/BMV Land*, Page 271.

1.2.10 PDA-008 – the points raised in this additional submission are addressed at:

a. Table 7-13, Theme: *Inefficiency of Proposed Development*, Page 332;

b. Table 7-6, Theme: *Use of Productive Agricultural Land/BMV Land*, Page 271;

c. Table 7-6, Theme: *Long Term Consequences for Land Use*, Page 272;

d. Table 7-12, Theme: *Preference for Alternative Sites for Solar Panels*, Page 322;

e. Table 7-14, Theme: *Safety Concerns & Fire Risk (BESS Specific)*, Page 337;

f. Table 7-9, Theme: *Impact of Glint & Glare on Persons*, Page 288;

g. Table 7-6, Theme: *Lack of Local Benefit for Jobs / Education*, Page 275; and

h. Table 7-3, Theme: *Impact on Wildlife Habitats*, Page 255.

1.2.11 PDA-012 – the points raised in this additional submission are addressed at:

a. Table 7-4, Theme: *Visual Impact of the Proposed Development*, Page 260;

b. Table 7-8, Theme: *Contamination of Groundwater & Soils*, Page 284;

c. Table 7-14, Theme: *Safety Concerns & Fire Risk (BESS Specific)*, Page 337;

d. Table 7-14, Theme: *Safety Concerns (Proposed Development as a Whole)*, Page 335;

e. Table 7-6, Theme: *Long Term Consequences for Land Use*, Page 272;

f. Table 7-12, Theme: *Preference for Alternative Sites for Solar Panels*, Page 322; and

g. Table 7-6, Theme: *Impact on UK Food Security*, Page 274.

1.2.12 PDA-013 – the points raised in this additional submission are addressed at:

a. Table 7-10, Theme: *Cumulative Effects of Numerous NSIPs in Lincolnshire*, Page 294;

b. Table 7-4, Theme: *Visual Impact of the Proposed Development*, Page 260; and

c. Table 7-6, Theme: *Use of Productive Agricultural Land/BMV Land*, Page 271.

1.2.13 PDA-014 – the points raised in this additional submission are addressed at:

a. Table 7-6, Theme: *Use of Productive Agricultural Land/BMV Land*, Page 271;

b. Table 7-4, Theme: *Visual Impact of the Proposed Development*, Page 260; and

c. Table 7-14, Theme: *Safety Concerns & Fire Risk (BESS Specific)*, Page 337.

Table 1-1: List of Statutory Consultees who submitted Relevant Representations

RR Reference Number	Statutory Consultee
RR-089	Environment Agency
RR-024	Anglian Water Services
RR-285	UK Health Security Agency
RR-107	Historic England
RR-201	National Highways
RR-199	National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc
RR-200	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc
RR-202	Natural England
RR-205	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
RR-278	The Coal Authority (trading name The Mining Remediation Authority)

Table 1-2: List of Local Authorities who submitted Relevant Representations

RR / Examination Reference Number	Local Authority
RR-157	Lincolnshire County Council
RR-210	North Kesteven District Council

Table 1-3: List of Parish Councils who submitted Relevant Representations

RR / Examination Reference Number	Parish Council
RR-032	Aubourn with Haddington Parish Council
RR-066	Coleby Parish Council
RR-288	Welbourn Parish Council
RR-256	Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council
RR-211	Norton Disney Parish Council
RR-282	Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council
RR-283	Thurlby Parish Council

Table 1-4: List of Non-Statutory Organisations who submitted Relevant Representations

RR / Examination Reference Number	Non-Statutory Consultee
RR-038	British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities
RR-039	British Pipeline Agency Ltd for Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd
RR-091	Forestry Commission
RR-156	Lincolnshire Against Needless Destruction
RR-159	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
RR-064	Cliff Villages Solar Action Group
RR-158	Lincolnshire Independents
RR-260	Springwell Solar Action Group

Table 1-5: List of Persons with an Interest in the Land that submitted Relevant Representations

RR / Examination Reference Number	Persons with an Interest in the Land
RR-060	Christopher Nevile
RR-080	Diane Plumb
RR-088	Emma Otter
RR-104	Harry Cotton
RR-127	Jo Mawditt
RR-163	Luke Daniels
RR-190	Michael Kenneth Hudson
RR-184	Mary Meredith
RR-206	Nick Lyons
RR-185	Megan Rosemary Taylor
RR-007	Allyson Sorrell
RR-183	Martin Sorrell
RR-208	Nicola Wetherill

Table 1-6: List of Members of the General Public that submitted Relevant Representations

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-001	Abigail Macniven
RR-002	Adam Sheldrick

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-003	Alan Vivian
RR-004	Alison Bowley-Webb
RR-005	Alison Noble
RR-006	Alison Phillips
RR-008	Alyson Spurr
RR-009	Amy Matthews
RR-010	Andrea Bellamy
RR-011	Andrea Marks
RR-012	Andrew Bellamy
RR-013	Andrew Cronin
RR-014	Andrew Hayward
RR-015	Andrew Keeling
RR-016	Andrew Nicholas Ellis
RR-017	Andrew Richard Jackson
RR-018	Andrew Spurr
RR-019	Andrew Winter
RR-020	Angela Crosby
RR-021	Angela Kidd
RR-022	Angela Lazenby
RR-023	Angela Stewart
RR-025	Ann Hayes
RR-026	Anna-Marie Marshall
RR-027	Anne Dorothy Houghton
RR-028	Anne Heard
RR-029	Anthony Paul Magri
RR-030	Anthony Philip McDonald
RR-031	Astleford
RR-033	Barry Smith
RR-034	Barry T H Devonald
RR-035	Beate Webb
RR-036	Benjamin Skipper
RR-037	Bernard Morris
RR-040	Bronte McLachlan
RR-041	Bryan Mellor
RR-042	Calum MacDonald
RR-043	Carl Anton John Koenen
RR-044	Carol Johns
RR-045	Caroline Kathel

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-046	Caroline Margaret Magri
RR-047	Carolyn Angel
RR-048	Carolyn Wheater
RR-049	Catherine Elizabeth Winter
RR-050	Celia Morris
RR-051	Charlotte Lee
RR-052	Cherry Wilkinson
RR-053	Cheryl O'Neill
RR-054	Chloe Williams
RR-055	Christine Anne Sweeting
RR-056	Christine Mary Munks
RR-057	Christine Muriel Waring
RR-058	Christine Williams
RR-059	Christopher Andreas Green
RR-061	Christopher Price
RR-062	Christopher Yarnell
RR-063	Claire Louise Brooke
RR-065	Clifford Medley
RR-067	David Charles Morris
RR-068	David East
RR-069	David John Owen
RR-070	David sellers
RR-071	David Stacey
RR-072	David Stocker
RR-073	David Walker
RR-074	David William Cox
RR-075	Dean William Alexander Miller
RR-076	Debbie Davidge
RR-077	Debbie Dawson
RR-078	Derek Todd
RR-079	Diane Elizabeth Swales
RR-081	Dr Caroline Johnson MP
RR-082	Dr. Marc Blair Naylor
RR-083	Duncan Innes
RR-084	Elaine Harris
RR-085	Elaine Hatzel
RR-086	Elizabeth Davis
RR-087	Emily Morris

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-090	Fiona Evans
RR-092	Frances Innes
RR-093	Frances Jane Brooks
RR-094	Gail Green
RR-095	GDPRFGES- 001
RR-096	Geoffrey David Lloyd
RR-097	Geoffrey Hewett
RR-098	Georgia Sargent
RR-099	Gillian A Anderson
RR-100	Gordon Kobish
RR-101	Graham Brown
RR-102	Graham Finney
RR-103	Graham Hamilton Bingley
RR-105	Hayley Marshall
RR-106	Heather Carpenter
RR-108	Hollingsworth
RR-109	Honor Lee
RR-110	Ian Watkins
RR-111	James Anderson
RR-112	James Barry Earnshaw
RR-113	James Edward George Kirby
RR-114	James Elliott
RR-115	James Gallagher
RR-116	James Gibb
RR-117	James Kirby
RR-118	Janet Elizabeth Wilkinson
RR-119	Janet McDermott-Brown
RR-120	Janet Morris
RR-121	Janette Margaret Wynn-Williams
RR-122	Janice Alicia Banks
RR-123	Jennifer Warnes
RR-124	Jeremy A D Mumby
RR-125	Jeremy Bloom
RR-126	Jill Kynman Wilson
RR-128	Joanne Shaw
RR-129	Joanne Twycross
RR-130	Joel David Cotton
RR-131	John Banks

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-132	John Brooke
RR-133	John Goldsbrough
RR-134	John Mosedale
RR-135	John Riley
RR-136	Jonathan Hickson
RR-137	Jonathan Mark Wilkinson
RR-138	Judith Sime
RR-139	Julie Hicks
RR-140	Julie Murray
RR-141	Julie Perkins
RR-142	June Baldwin-Hay
RR-143	Karen Hunt
RR-144	Karl Nelson
RR-145	Kate Elizabeth Price
RR-146	Katherine Jackson-Soutter
RR-147	Kathryn J Campbell
RR-148	Katina Johnson
RR-149	Kay Parker
RR-150	Keith Jackson
RR-151	Kelvin Scully
RR-152	Kevin Gilbert
RR-153	Knud Christensen
RR-154	Lauren Williams
RR-155	Lesley Burnett
RR-160	Lisa Cronin
RR-161	Lorraine Moody
RR-162	Lucy Stones
RR-164	Lynda Fletcher
RR-165	Lynda Steer
RR-166	Lynne Carter
RR-167	Malcolm Robert Ramsay
RR-168	Malvina Todd
RR-169	Marc Roberts
RR-170	Marc Williams
RR-171	Margaret Owen
RR-172	Marianne Overton MBE
RR-173	Marie Frances Elliott
RR-174	Marisha Lowe

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-175	Mark Bindley
RR-176	Mark Bindley
RR-177	Mark Hutchings
RR-178	Mark John Thompson
RR-179	Mark Lees[1]
RR-180	Mark Raisin
RR-181	Mark Waring
RR-182	Mark Wheater
RR-186	Michael Batt
RR-187	Michael Curling
RR-188	Michael H Round
RR-189	Michael Habblett
RR-191	Michael O'Neill
RR-192	Michael S O'N Campbell
RR-193	Mr Stephen Sholl
RR-194	Mr. Martin Elvin
RR-195	Mrs C J Marriott
RR-196	Mrs L J Bradford
RR-197	Mrs Sarah Raisin
RR-198	Mrs Susan Kobish
RR-203	Neal Kathel
RR-204	Neil Robins
RR-207	Nicola OBrien
RR-209	Nigel Guz
RR-212	Oliver Davis
RR-213	Oliver Sargent
RR-214	Olivia Mawditt
RR-215	Pamela Lilian Whittaker
RR-216	Patrick Doody
RR-217	Paul Colin
RR-218	Paul Morris
RR-219	Peter G Phillips
RR-220	Peter Hewett
RR-221	Phil Emsley
RR-222	Philip John Heard
RR-223	Philip John Sweeting
RR-224	Philip Robert Niner
RR-225	Quentin Stott

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-226	R Davis
RR-227	Rachael Adair
RR-228	Rachael Hayward
RR-229	Rachel Barrett
RR-230	Rebecca Louise Onians
RR-231	Rebecca Major
RR-232	Rev Andrew C Vaughan
RR-233	Rhydain Wynn-Williams
RR-234	Richard Durance
RR-235	Richard G Westlake
RR-236	Richard James Karl Shepherd
RR-237	Richard Lee
RR-238	Robert Bentley Nelstrop
RR-239	Robert Brewer
RR-240	Robert Fletcher
RR-241	Robert John Stewart
RR-242	Robert Lee
RR-243	Robert Wilkinson
RR-244	Roberts
RR-245	Roger Clifford How
RR-246	Ronald de Raad
RR-247	Roy Husemeyer
RR-248	Roy Martin
RR-249	Ruth Abrahams
RR-250	S Davis
RR-251	Sally Green
RR-252	Sally MacDonald
RR-253	Sam Barker
RR-254	Sam Woolley
RR-255	Sarah Melladay
RR-257	Sharon Patricia Batt
RR-258	Shirley Hughes
RR-259	Simon Makinson-Sanders
RR-261	Stella Ryde
RR-262	Stephen Crust
RR-263	Stephen Hicks
RR-264	Stephen McCracken
RR-265	Steven Lowe

RR / Examination Reference Number	Member of General Public
RR-266	Steven Marshall
RR-267	Stuart Elms
RR-268	Sue Sullivan-Bissett
RR-269	Susan Ellis
RR-270	Susan Gordon
RR-271	Susan J Elvin
RR-272	Susan Makinson-Sanders
RR-273	Susan Mary Stevens
RR-274	Susan Osborn
RR-275	Susan Stentiford
RR-276	Sylvia Lyons
RR-277	Terence Johnson
RR-279	Thomas Fenn
RR-280	Thomas Gemmill
RR-281	Thomas William Shrubb
RR-284	Tracey Whitton
RR-286	W I Williams
RR-287	Watts household
RR-289	Wendy Pamela Mcdonald
RR-290	William Frank Morris
RR-291	Worthington family on behalf of Worthington
RR-292	Zoe Ollerearnshaw

1.2.14 For ease of reference, a table of acronyms used in this document is provided in **Table 1-7**.

Table 1-7: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
AC	Alternating Current
ACM	Asbestos Containing Material
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
AWS	Anglian Water Services
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System
BMV	Best and Most Versatile Land
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
BPA	British Pipeline Agency Limited

Abbreviation	Definition
BS	British Standard
BSI	British Standards Institution
BSMP	Battery Safety Management Plan
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CNP	Critical National Priority
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate Change's
DEFRA	Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DEMP	Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan
DMP	Dust Management Plan
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
DRA	Dust Risk Assessment
EA	Environment Agency
EcOW	Ecological Clerk of Works
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMF	Electromagnetic Fields
EPD	Environmental Product Declaration
ERP	Emergency Response Plan
ES	Environmental Statement
ESSCP	Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan
ExA	Examining Authority
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
GPG	Good Practice Guidance
GVA	Gross Value Added
GWh	Gigawatt hours
Ha	Hectares
HCA	Homes and Communities Agency
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HER	Historic Environmental Record

Abbreviation	Definition
HPA	Health Protection Agency
HV	High Voltage
IAQM	Institute of Air Quality Management
ICNIRP	International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection
IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
INNS	Invasive Non Native Species
IP	Interested Party
IRENA	International Renewable Energy Agency
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
kV	Kilovolt
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council
LCoW	Landscape Clerk of Works
LEMP	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
LFRS	Local Fire and Rescue Service
LGV	Local Good Vehicle
LIQ	Land Interest Questionnaire
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LSFT	Large Scale Fire Testing
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
LWT	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
MSA	Mineral Safeguarding Area
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt Hours
NCA	National Character Area
NE	Natural England
NERC	Natural Environment and Rural Communities
NFCC	National Fire Chiefs Council
NGED	National Grid Energy Distribution
NGET	National Grid Energy Transmission
NH	National Highways

Abbreviation	Definition
NHLE	National Heritage List for England
NKDC	North Kesteven District Council
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
NPS	National Policy Statement
NPSE	Noise Policy Statement for England
NRMM	Non-Road Mobile Machinery
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OEMP	Operational Environmental Management Plan
PEA	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
PEI Report	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PFAS	per-and poly fluoroalkyl substances
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
PRoW	Public Right of Way
PRoWMP	Public Right of Way Management Plan
PV	Photovoltaic
RAF	Royal Air Force
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SMP	Soil Management Plan
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoS	Secretary of State
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPZ	Source Protection Zone
SRN	Strategic Road Network
SSEP	Strategic Spatial Energy Plan
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems
SWDS	Surface Water Drainage Strategy
SWMP	Site Waste Management Plan
TA	Transport Assessment
tCO2e	Tonnes CO2 Equivalent
TEC	Transmission Entry Capacity
TCPA	Town and Country Planning Act

Abbreviation	Definition
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
TTM	Temporary Traffic Management
UKHSA	UK Health Security Agency
WCA	Wildlife and Countryside Act
WCHAR	Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment
WEEE	Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WHO	World Health Organisation
WMP	Water Management Plan
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation
WRAP	Waste and Resources Action Programme
WRMP	Water Resources Management Plan
ZoI	Zone of Influence
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Influence

2. Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations

2.1 Environment Agency

Table 2-1: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Environment Agency

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
RR-089	1	**EA01 – Requirement 10 (Surface and foul water drainage)** *(3.1 Draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]** – Schedule 2 – Requirements)* Issue: The Environment Agency is not listed as a named consultee for the discharge of Requirement 10 (Surface and foul water drainage). Impact: Increased risk of detrimental impacts to controlled waters in the absence of the final details relating to surface and foul water drainage. Solution: We request to be consulted on the surface and foul water drainage details required to be approved under Requirement 10 (Surface and foul water drainage).	The Applicant agrees to include the Environment Agency as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 10(1) (Surface and foul water drainage). The Draft DCO **[APP-016]** has been updated accordingly and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.
	2	**EA02 – Permitted Preliminary Works** *(3.1 Draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**, Part 1: Preliminary. Article 2 'Interpretation'; Schedule 2 – Requirements)* Issue: The definition of "permitted preliminary works" includes (d) remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions', while the definition of "commence" excludes activities defined as "permitted preliminary works". Impact: The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) secured via Requirement 12, only requires submission of a detailed CEMP prior to commencement. This means that remediation of the site could take place without the CEMP being approved or in place and therefore without the controls offered by the CEMP. Solution: We request that either '(d) remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions' is removed from the "permitted preliminary works" definition, or Requirement 12 is amended to include the following clause, "for the purposes of 12(1) 'commence' must include 'remedial work in respect of any contamination'. If the Applicant can point to an alternative satisfactory control to the CEMP then we will consider that. It should be made clear that the Applicant will follow the Environment Agency's Land contamination risk management (LCRM) guidance, which is available on GOV.UK.	With regards to potential remediation works, the Applicant proposes to include a new sub-paragraph to Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** as follows: *"(4) for the purposes of sub-paragraph (1), "commence" includes remedial work in respect of any contamination."* The updated Draft DCO **[APP-016]** will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. With regards to following the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance, the Applicant notes this comment – paragraph 9.7.48 of the Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** has been updated for clarity and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 9.7.48 now reads: *"Nonetheless, prior to construction works commencing, a targeted scheme of Ground Investigation and testing followed by a Quantitative Risk Assessment will be completed. This will be in accordance, if and where necessary, with ~~CLR11 Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land (Ref. 9-98),~~ BS10175:2011+ A2:2017 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites: Code of Practice (Ref 9-98), BS 5930:2015+A1:2020 Code of Practice for Ground Investigations (Ref 9-99), and the Environment Agency's ~~GPLC1 Guiding Principles for Land Contamination in Assessing Risks to Controlled Waters~~ Land contamination risk management (LCRM) (Ref ~~9-99~~ 9-97)."*
	3	**EA03 – Discharge of Requirements procedure**	The procedure for discharge of the Requirements is contained in Schedule 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. That Schedule specifies (at paragraph 2(3)(b)) that the undertaker must confirm to the discharging authority that the application for discharge has been provided to the relevant consultees under the requirement. Paragraph 3(3) then requires the discharging authority to

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		As a named consultee on the discharge of several Requirements, we request the provision of at least 21 calendar / 15 business days in which to respond to the discharge authority. This should be reflected in the dDCO.	issue the consultation on the discharge application to the requirement consultee within 10 working days of receiving the discharge application. However, nowhere in the procedure does it specify a time frame within which consultation responses must be received. Instead, paragraph 2 provides that the discharging authority must notify the undertaker of its decision on the discharge application within 10 weeks of receipt (unless a longer period is agreed). The Applicant has therefore amended paragraph 5(5) of Schedule 15 so that it provides (amendments shown in red): "*Where an application has been made to the relevant planning authority for any discharge, the undertaker will also submit a copy of that application to any requirement consultee and the requirement consultee will be given no less than 15 working days in which to respond to the relevant planning authority."* For the Environment Agency's reference, 'working days' is defined in paragraph 1 of Schedule 15 as *"a day other than Saturday or Sunday which is not Christmas Day, Good Friday or a public holiday or bank holiday under section 1 of the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971."* This amendment will be reflected in the version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.
	4	**EA04 – Disapplication of flood risk activity permits (FRAPs)** We note the Applicant is seeking disapplication of regulation 12 (requirement for environmental permit) of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016(d) in respect of a flood risk activity only. We have not agreed to the disapplication of FRAPs, but discussions with the Applicant have been initiated. Should we agree to the disapplication of FRAPs, protective provisions for our benefit must be included in the dDCO. Currently there is no form of protective provisions for our benefit in the dDCO in this regard. The current situation is that we have provided our standard protective provisions to the Applicant and requested the following: • Written confirmation that the Applicant wishes to disapply FRAPs • Information on where the flood risk activities will take place • Basic information of the activities proposed Given the above, discussions are ongoing. However, it should be noted that there remains the possibility that we may not agree to the disapplication of FRAPs. It is important to note that proposed works within the Witham Washlands Flood Storage Area may need to be considered in greater detail within a FRAP application post-decision. This may mean that disapplication of FRAPs is unsuitable in this instance.	The Applicant has now agreed with the Environment Agency that it will not be seeking to disapply the requirement to obtain an environmental permit under Regulation 12 of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. As such, it has removed Article 6(1)(e) from the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** so that Regulation 12 (requirement for environmental permit) of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 is no longer disapplied for the purposes of the authorised development. This has also been reflected in an updated version of the Consents, Agreement and Position Statement **[APP-182]** and Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**. These updated documents will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. As such, protective provisions for the benefit of the Environment Agency are not required for inclusion in Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Disapplication of FRAPs is also referenced in paragraph 9.6.81(b) of the ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** and paragraph 1.4.2 (j) of the Consents Agreement and Position Statement (Rev 1) **[APP-182]**.	
	5	**EA05 – Disapplication of Water Resources Act 1991** We note the Applicant is seeking disapplication of the provisions of any byelaws made under, or having effect as if made under, paragraphs 5, 6 or 6A of Schedule 25 (byelaw making powers of the appropriate agency) to the Water Resources Act 1991. We have not agreed to disapply the Water Resources Act at this stage, but we request that clarification is provided by the Applicant on the need to disapply in this regard. It should be noted that we would only agree to the disapplication of byelaws under the Water Resources Act where we have agreed to the disapplication of the requirement for a FRAP and accordingly agree protective provisions.	The Applicant is reviewing the position in this regard and considering whether the disapplication is required. The Applicant will liaise directly with the EA in relation to this and is hoping to have an update by Deadline 2.
	6	**EA06 – Environment Agency land interests** We have reviewed the Book of Reference **[APP-022]** and Land Plans **[APP-007 / APP-007]** and we have the following comments: Environment Agency land in plots 11 and 12 seem be outside of the boundary of the deed of grant. The land in question owned by the Environment Agency is a pumping station used for flood risk management purposes, so any development/easement cannot impede its operation is flood management. The Book of Reference refers to the Environment Agency being occupiers on several other parcels. We understand that these are in reference to the Witham Washlands (Lincoln) Flood Storage Area, which we have right to flood agreements over. The development will need to consider our rights to utilise this land and cannot impede its use in storing water during flood events. The Applicant will also need to comply with the conditions of any FRAPs before we can agree easements/acquisition of rights from a landowner perspective. These factors could impact on whether or not we agree to the disapplication of FRAPs, which are 'under discussion'. The Applicant will need to discuss our land interests with our Estates Team.	The Applicant acknowledges that the Environment Agency has various interests in respect of rights and apparatus within the proposed Order Limits. The interests in terms of land plots which have been identified can be found within the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and can be identified on the Land Plans **[AS-005]**. The Applicant will continue to engage with the relevant estates team to ensure the Book of Reference and associated documents are accurate and up to date.
	7	**EA07 – Witham Washlands (Lincoln) Flood Storage Area – HDD construction compound** *(6.3 ES Appendix 9-C Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** – paragraph 5.2.3)* Issue: A temporary Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) construction compound is proposed to be located within the eastern extent of the Witham Washlands Flood Storage Area. Impact: The Witham Washlands Flood Storage Area is classified as Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain). There are potential impacts to the operation of the storage area and storage volumes if works are carried out and during a flood event. Solution: All works proposed to be carried out within the storage area will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP). We require further detail on the proposed construction compounds and	The Applicant notes the requirement for a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) prior to carrying out works within the Witham Washlands Flood Storage Area, and to provide further detail post consent to demonstrate that the works will not adversely impact flood risk to the Proposed Development or elsewhere. Figure 3-1: Construction Compounds and Access Locations **[AS-021]** indicates the locations of the two proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) camp areas, to facilitate the drilling of cables beneath the flood defences along the River Brant and under the River Brant itself. Section 5.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** discusses the temporary compounds for the two proposed HDD camps, one of which will be within Flood Zone 3b of the Witham Washlands Flood Storage Area and Table 4: Water Environment of the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) **[APP-189]**, includes mitigation measures within WAT

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		temporary works activities prior to determining whether the works at the proposed locations are suitable.	C-5; Management of Flood Risk, parts f to h, noting that the HDD camps will be in-situ for a short duration of 2-4 days, and providing a commitment that the Contractor will check the ground conditions onsite, water levels in the watercourse, and weather forecasts daily and postpone the HDD works if the HDD camp locations are already flooded or if heavy rain is forecast in the few days before or during the HDD camp setup. The camps can be demobilised within 0.5 days to 1 day if flooding is expected. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** also notes in WAT C-5; Management of Flood Risk, part h that no soil from trenching will be kept within the extents of the Witham Washlands FSA during the works, to ensure no loss of floodplain during the works. The camps will also be set back sufficiently from flood defences to ensure their structure is not compromised during construction.
	8	**EA08 – Flow direction of main rivers** *(6.1 ES Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation **[APP-033]** – Table 8-10)* Issue: Incorrect direction of flow for the River Witham and River Brant. Impact: Downstream effects on fish may not have been correctly assessed. Solution: According to our records, the River Witham and River Brant run from south to north, not north to south. This should be corrected. Whilst this may seem a minor point, it is important the baseline environment is depicted accurately and factually to ensure clarity.	It is acknowledged that the direction of flow of the River Witham and River Brant in Table 8-10 is incorrectly stated – this has been corrected within Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** for clarity and the updated chapter will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. However, the assessment presented within Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**, including the relevant appendix on fish; Appendix 8-C Aquatic Ecology of the ES **[AS-081]**, has considered both upstream and downstream impacts and all references to locations of desk study data, designated sites and protected species (including fish) either upstream or downstream are correct. Therefore, it can be confirmed that the aquatic ecology baseline assessment presented in the ES is accurate.
	9	**EA09 – Protection of fish during spawning** *(6.1 ES Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation **[APP-033]** – Table 8-13;* *6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – paragraph 9.5.31;* *6.3 ES Appendix 8-C Aquatic Ecology **[Rev 1 APP-135 / Rev 2 AS-081]** – paragraph 5.2.7)* Issue: Ensuring all fish species are protected during spawning when completing in channel works. Impact: Damage to spawning habitat, loss of fish eggs and disturbance to spawning fish if adequate protection is not in place. Solution: Update the mitigation measures to confirm suitable protection measures to ensure that all fish species, including coarse fish, are not adversely impacted by the works. The work avoidance period should also encompass the coarse fish spawning season, which runs from March 15th to June 15th (inclusive). This restriction applies in areas where coarse fish populations or spawning habitats are known to exist. However, if evidence confirms that the area is not used for spawning or that spawning fish are absent, in-channel works may proceed, provided that appropriate fish rescue measures are carried out. We note that in '6.3 Appendix 8-C: Aquatic Ecology', paragraph 5.2.7, and in '6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment', paragraph 9.5.31, it is stated that no suitable spawning habitat for fish was	The reference to no suitable spawning habitat for fish having been identified in any of the surveyed waterbodies within Appendix 8-C: Aquatic Ecology of the ES **[AS-081]**, paragraph 5.2.7, and Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** paragraph 9.5.31, relates to notable fish species, not coarse fish species. With regards to the mitigation measures around all fish species (including coarse species), the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ECO-C4) notes the requirement for activities where there are direct impacts to watercourses or water bodies, for example through drain-down, culverting, or open trenching to avoid key fish migration timings wherever practicable. This is inclusive of the coarse fish spawning season. However, for clarity, measure ECO-C4 of Table 3 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Measure ECO-C4 (b) now reads: *"avoidance of key fish migration timings wherever practicable, including the avoidance of the coarse fish spawning season, which runs from March 15th to June 15th (inclusive);"*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		identified in any of the surveyed waterbodies. The applicant should confirm if this also includes for coarse fish species, or only the notable species present in the desk study. Under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975, it is an offence to wilfully disturb any spawn or spawning fish, or any bed, bank or shallow on which any spawn or spawning fish may be.	
	10	**EA10 – Invasive species – Signal Crayfish** *(6.3 ES Appendix 8-C Aquatic Ecology **[Rev 1 APP-135 / Rev 2 AS-081]*** *7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-189]** – Table 3)* Issue: It is not clear that Signal Crayfish (Pacifastacus leniusculus), which are an invasive non-native species (INNS), have been adequately considered, resulting in insufficient mitigation. Impact: Potential to introduce/spread Signal Crayfish within or beyond the DCO Order Limits during the construction of the Proposed Development, thereby impacting the aquatic environment. Solution: As outlined within Table 3 of the '7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1)' **[APP-189]**, pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to provide an update on the presence and location of any INNS plant species. This should be extended to include Signal Crayfish surveys with the findings being used to inform mitigation measures which will be included within the Biosecurity Management Plan. Signal Crayfish are listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) which makes it an offence to cause its spread. Our records indicate that Signal Crayfish are prevalent within this part of Witham catchment. Records of Signal Crayfish are not present on the National Biodiversity Network (NBN) Atlas, so would not have been captured within the desk study for the Aquatic Ecology report. It is indicated that Signal crayfish were also not found during the Macroinvertebrate Surveys, highlighting they may be absent from the DCO site, or the survey technique may not be suitable for this species.	Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** assessed the "*Introduction and, or, spread of invasive species, due to the movement of personnel, equipment and plant machinery, potentially facilitating the introduction of invasive species*" (ref. paragraph 8.9.2, item f). This inherently included consideration of both invasive plant and animal species. As such, it can be confirmed that the potential impact of the invasive Signal Crayfish has been duly considered within the assessment presented in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. However, the Applicant notes this comment and recognises that the mitigation measure regarding INNS should reflect the potential presence of invasive animals, and not just plants. As such, measure ECO-C11 of Table 3 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to clarify this. Measure ECO-C11 now reads: *"Pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to provide an update on the presence and location of any Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) plant and animal species, the findings of which will inform the implementation of measures to prevent their spread into the wild. These surveys will inform the production of a Biosecurity Management Plan which will set out procedures to ensure that no INNS ~~plant~~ species are brought onto the DCO Site (e.g., Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (Ref 7 Schedule 9 species) and will be formalised in the detailed CEMP, secured through the DCO. In the event that any future infestations of INNS are identified prior to and or during the development process, exclusion zones will be established around them, and an ECoW contacted for advice as required."* Sub-paragraph (1) of Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** includes the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final CEMP.
	11	**EA11 – Stopping works where potentially contaminated land is encountered** *(7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-189]** – Table 10, ID: GC-C1;* *7.8 Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-190]** – Table 12, ID: GC-01;* *7.9 Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-191]** – Table 10, ID: GC-D1)* Issue: The list of mitigation measures in the framework environmental management plans does not explicitly mention stopping works in the affected area where potentially contaminated land is encountered during works. Impact: Works may not stop in the event that potential contamination is found, which presents a risk to controlled waters from land contamination. Solution: We suggest updating the list in any future revision(s) of the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (FCEMP), Framework Operational Environmental Management	The Applicant notes this comment – measure GC-C1 of Table 10 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to clarify this. Measure GC-C1 now reads: *"(e) Should any potentially contaminated ground, including isolated 'hotspots' of contamination and/or potential deposits of asbestos containing materials (ACM), be encountered, works will be stopped in the affected area and the contractor would be required to investigate the areas and assess the need for containment or disposal of the material. The contractor would also be required to assess whether any additional health and safety measures are required;"* and: *"(g) In the event that contamination is identified, works will be stopped in the affected area and appropriate remediation measures would be agreed with the appropriate authorities and undertaken to protect construction workers, future site users, water resources, structures, and services;"*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Plan (FOEMP) and Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (FDEMP), so that all information is together. We previously requested this be included in relation to the statutory pre-application consultation. It has been added to the FCEMP below the main list of measures but not been added to the FOEMP or FDEMP. The FCEMP is not clear as information is duplicated, and the update we requested is separate from other relevant information. The update we previously requested is missing from the FOEMP and FDEMP. In particular, in the FCEMP, a separate paragraph is given below the list, but it is confusing as the matter is also included in the list with different information (sub-paragraph e. and g.). No such addition has been made to the FOEMP (sub-paragraph f. and h.) or FDEMP (sub-paragraphs i. to l.).	Furthermore, to avoid duplication, the paragraph below the list which references works stopping within measure GC-C1 of Table 10 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been removed, given that this is now stated in items (e) and (g), as above. Measure GC-O1 of Table 12 of the Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) **[APP-190]** has also been updated for clarity and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Measure GC-O1 now reads: *"(f) Should any potentially contaminated ground, including isolated 'hotspots' of contamination and/or potential deposits of asbestos containing materials (ACM), be encountered, works will be stopped in the affected area and the maintenance and replacement works contractors would be required to investigate the areas and assess the need for containment or disposal of the material. They would also be required to assess whether any additional health and safety measures, such as the use of suitable respiratory protective equipment, is required;"* and: *"(h) In the event that contamination is identified, works will be stopped in the affected area and appropriate remediation measures would be agreed with the appropriate authorities and undertaken to protect construction workers, future site users, water resources, structures, and services;"* Measure GC-D1 of Table 10 of the Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) **[APP-191]** has also been updated for clarity and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Measure GC-D1 now reads: *"(j) Should any potentially contaminated ground, including isolated 'hotspots' of contamination and/or potential deposits of asbestos containing materials (ACM), be encountered, works will be stopped in the affected area and the Principal Contractor will be required to investigate the areas and assess the need for containment or disposal of the material. Advice should be sought from an environmental specialist should materials suspected of being contaminated be found. The Principal Contractor will also be required to assess whether any additional health and safety measures are required;"* and: *"(l) In the event that contamination is identified, works will be stopped in the affected area and appropriate remediation measures will be taken to protect decommissioning workers, future site users, water resources, structures, and services;"*
	12	**EA12 – Assessment of impacts on groundwater quality** *(6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – paragraph 9.7.48)* Issue: In relation to assessing impacts on groundwater quality, reference is made to CLR11 'Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land' and the Environment Agency's GPLC1 'Guiding Principles for Land Contamination in Assessing Risks to Controlled Waters' to support site investigation design. These documents are out of date and have been superseded.	The Applicant notes this comment – paragraph 9.7.48 of the Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** has been updated for clarity and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 9.7.48 now reads: *"Nonetheless, prior to construction works commencing, a targeted scheme of Ground Investigation and testing followed by a Quantitative Risk Assessment will be completed. This will be in accordance, if and where necessary, with ~~CLR11 Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land (Ref. 9-98),~~ BS10175:2011+ A2:2017 Investigation of Potentially*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Impact: Risk that the site investigation might not be conducted in line with current best practice guidance. Solution: It should be made clear that the latest guidance will be used. We strongly recommend that the applicant updates the references to site investigation guidance and instead refers to the Environment Agency's Land contamination risk management (LCRM) pages on GOV.UK. We have previously raised this issue with the applicant. Please see our comment on in '7.11 Potential Main Issues for Examination (Rev 1)' **[APP-193]** reference ID WE14. We would also expect use of BS 5930:2015+A1:2020 Code of Practice for Ground Investigations and BS 10175:2011+A2:2017 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice. These reports are referenced in '6.3 ES Appendix 14-C Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment' **[APP-170]**, paragraph 1.2.4.	*Contaminated Sites: Code of Practice (Ref 9-98), BS 5930:2015+A1:2020 Code of Practice for Ground Investigations (Ref 9-99), and the Environment Agency's ~~GPLC1 Guiding Principles for Land Contamination in Assessing Risks to Controlled Waters~~ Land contamination risk management (LCRM) (Ref ~~9-99~~ 9-97)."*
	13	**EA13 – HDD – drilling fluid breakout (groundwater)** *(6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]**;* *7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-189]** – Table 4, ID: WAT-C6)* Issue: Insufficient consideration of the effects on groundwater in case of the accidental release or spillage of drilling fluids during Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The proposed mitigation measures presented lack detail. There is no mention of preparing a drilling fluid breakout plan. Impact: Potential unacceptable risk to groundwater in case of accidental release or spillage of drilling fluids. Solution: Produce a detailed drilling fluid breakout plan and ensure groundwater is included. This could be a standalone document, within the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan or another appropriate document. The Environment Agency has previously raised the risk of drilling fluids being released into groundwater. In Table 9-1 of 6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]**, the Applicant states the effects of the release of drilling fluids have been assessed within this chapter, but there is still no mention of groundwater in the relevant sections. Discussion of drilling fluid and hydraulic fracture in the body of Chapter 9 is paragraphs 9.6.22 to 9.6.26, and 9.7.11, but leakage to groundwater is not mentioned (only watercourses). The same information is given in Table 4 (ID: WAT-C6) of the 7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-189]**. We raised this in our PEIR consultation response (issue E9). We are highlighting this again to request that groundwater is not overlooked in any future hydraulic fracture risk assessments and drilling fluid breakout plans. Any ingress of groundwater to the send and receive pits (paragraph 9.6.29) must also be appropriately managed in line with guidance and legislation (as discussed in paragraphs 9.6.80 to 9.6.82).	The Applicant has committed to developing a Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. WAT-C6). As described in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** paragraph 9.6.22-9.6.23, this will include appropriate management of drilling muds which otherwise have the potential to 'break out' and thereby impact water bodies, including groundwater. The Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment will be a site-specific risk assessment, developed prior to construction following further investigation of specific ground conditions at the crossing locations. It is acknowledged that Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** and the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** do not explicitly state that this risk assessment would cover groundwater as well as surface water. However, as the risk assessment is inherently related to ground conditions, groundwater will be accounted for. It should be noted that the potential impact upon groundwater as a result of accidental release or spillage of drilling fluids during HDD has been considered as relevant within the assessment presented in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**. To better reflect the fact that potential effects on groundwater will be a key consideration of the Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment, Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** and the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** have been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to clarify this. Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** now states the following in paragraph 9.6.22-23: "*There are risks associated with the use of drilling muds and plant close to ~~channel~~ surface water and groundwater bodies. For example, although rare, without due care there is a risk that drilling muds can 'break out' into ~~watercourses~~ water bodies leading to pollution (known as 'hydraulic fracture' or 'frac-out'). A site-specific Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment would be developed prior to construction following further investigation of specific ground conditions at the crossing locations, and appropriate mitigation developed in line with best construction practice.* *There is also a need to manage drilling muds and wastewater so that this will not be spilt into the channel when working close to ~~the banks of~~ a groundwater body or watercourses. The requirement for a Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment is included in the Framework CEMP **[EN010154/APP/7.7]** and will be secured through a requirement of the DCO."* The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Sub-

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
			paragraph (1) of this Requirement includes the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final CEMP. Similarly, WAT-C6 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to state: "*d. A site-specific hydraulic fracture risk assessment including details of drilling fluid management would be developed prior to construction following further investigation of specific ground conditions at the crossing locations, and appropriate mitigation developed in line with best construction practice. There is also a need to manage drilling muds and wastewater so that this would not ~~be spilt into the channel when working close to the banks of a watercourse~~ pollute groundwater or surface water bodies."* With regard to groundwater ingress to send and receive pits, the relevant representation notes that Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** discusses management of groundwater ingress to send and receive pits in paragraph 9.6.29. This indicates that a shoring system appropriate to the ground conditions will be used as appropriate to minimise water ingress into the pits. The ingress of any groundwater will be carefully managed through design of the send or receive pit, shoring method, and a pumping and treatment system. Likely permit and consent requirements are listed in paragraphs 9.6.80 to 9.6.82.
	14	**EA14 – HDD – drilling fluid breakout (surface water)** *(6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – sections 9.6.22 & 9.6.25;* *7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-189]** – Table 4)* Issue: Paragraphs 9.6.22 and 9.6.25 of the ES Chapter 9 **[APP-034]**, and Table 4 in the FCEMP **[APP-189]** state that a Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment will be completed to manage the Trenchless Crossings of the River Witham and River Brant by HDD, however it is unclear if this assessment will include details of drilling fluid breakout management. Impact: Frac-outs during are not uncommon during HDD and can result in fine sediments being released which can reduce the water quality if it enters surface water runoff or directly enter watercourses. Solution: The Applicant must produce a drilling fluid management plan, as part of the CEMP, and must take all the steps that are reasonably practicable to minimise pollution during HDD. Please be advised that we are aware certain bentonite pellets, used in HDD, are coated in PFAS (per-and poly fluoroalkyl substances). The Applicant should check with their contractor that their bentonite is PFAS-free.	The Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment will include details on drilling fluid management. The purpose of the Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment is to assess the ground conditions and develop an appropriate methodology for the HDD to minimise pollution risk (via frac-out) to groundwater or surface water bodies. The Hydraulic Fracture Risk Assessment is secured via the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, a detailed version of which will be developed, substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, as secured under Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Sub-paragraph (1) of this Requirement includes the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final CEMP. Measure WAT-C6 of Table 4 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated for clarity and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Measure WAT-C6 now includes the following wording: "*d. A site-specific hydraulic fracture risk assessment including details of drilling fluid management would be developed prior to construction following further investigation of specific ground conditions at the crossing locations, and appropriate mitigation developed in line with best construction practice. There is also a need to manage drilling muds and wastewater so that this would not ~~be spilt into the channel when working close to the banks of a watercourse~~ pollute groundwater or surface water bodies".* A contractor has not been appointed at this stage but once appointed it will be confirmed that any bentonite pellets to be used in HDD activities will be PFAS-free. To ensure this measure is in place, measure WAT-C6 of Table 4 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated for clarity and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Measure WAT-C6 now includes: *"(n) any bentonite pellets to be used in HDD activities will be PFAS (per-and poly fluoroalkyl substances) free."*
	15	**EA15 – Swales around BESS – treatment of surface water** *(6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – paragraph 9.7.76;*	It is widely recognised that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) such as swales can provide treatment for surface water runoff. This is summarised within CIRIA C753 The SuDS Manual[1] produced by the Construction Industry Research and Information Association, which outlines the

[1] Construction Industry Research and Information Association (2015) C753 The SuDS Manual

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		*6.3 ES Appendix 9-D Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy **[APP-147]** –paragraph 4.1.7)* Issue: It is stated that the swales around battery energy storage system (BESS) areas will collect and treat surface water before discharge. It is unclear how the swales will treat the water, or what treatment operation the swales will perform. Impact: The method of treatment may not be suitable or adequate, which risk impacting on water quality. Solution: Provide further detail on how swales will treat surface water before discharge. Include methodology and any checks that will be in place.	'treatment' that a variety of SuDS can provide with regard to surface water runoff, provided they are appropriately designed and maintained. To determine whether a surface water drainage treatment train is sufficient, the Simple Index Approach is applied, as outlined in The SuDS Manual. The methodology for the Simple Index Approach assessment is provided in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**, paragraph 9.4.25 to 9.4.28. The assessment itself is undertaken in Appendix 9-D: Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy (SWDS) (Section 4.6) **[APP-147]** and summarised within Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**. Although the swale is lined, it will have planting within it, in the soil layer above the liner, to treat runoff. The assessment indicates that the swale provides adequate treatment in terms of water quality. The Simple Index Approach is the industry standard approach for ensuring that sufficient treatment has been incorporated into a drainage design. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** includes a requirement (ref. WAT-O5) for regular inspection and maintenance of the SuDS to ensure performance is maintained as expected throughout the operation phase. It should be noted that the Simple Index Approach does not apply to firefighting water, and its potential contaminants. As set out in the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. WAT-O3) any external firewater runoff from BESS areas would be contained within the swale via a penstock valve. Any fire water that collects in the lined swales would be tested and if found to be contaminated, it would be pumped out by a suitable contractor for off-site disposal at a licensed waste facility. The swale would then be cleaned of all contaminants. If it were not found to be contaminated, water would be released, with agreement of the Environment Agency if a permit was required. The provision of a detailed OEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework OEMP, is secured via Requirement 13 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Sub-paragraph (1) of this Requirement includes the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final OEMP.
	16	**EA16 – BESS – penstock valves and swales** *(6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – paragraphs 9.6.69, 9.7.78 & 9.7.84;* *6.3 ES Appendix 9-D Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy **[APP-147]** – sections 4.1.9 & 4.11.5;* *7.8 Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-190]** – Table 6, ID: WAT-03;* *7.17 Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-198]** – paragraphs 3.2.12, 4.3.7 & 4.5.5)* Issue: It is stated that penstocks are to be used on swales around BESS areas to isolate water from reaching the wider environment, which we agree with. However, it is not specified if these will be automatically activated in the event of a fire. Impact: Firewater and other chemicals from BESS pose an unacceptable risk to the water environment receptors and will deteriorate controlled waters unless it is contained sufficiently. Manually activated penstocks may not be closed quickly or effectively enough to capture firewater, which presents a water pollution risk.	The Applicant agrees to commit to automated penstocks. The Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) **[APP-198]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The Framework BSMP now includes the following text at paragraph 4.3.7: "*The BESS will integrate an external firefighting water capture drainage system. In the event of a fire, and prior to applying the fire water, the outfalls from the BESS areas will be closed via automatic penstock valves or similar systems, isolating the BESS areas drainage from the wider environment*." Paragraph 4.5.5 also now reads: *"In the event of a fire, and prior to applying the fire water, the outfalls from the BESS areas will be closed via automatic penstock valves or similar systems, isolating the BESS areas drainage from the wider environment."* The Applicant also acknowledges the requirement for maintenance/testing of the penstock valves. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The Framework BSMP now includes the following text at paragraph 3.2.12: "*Furthermore, penstocks will be inspected and operated as per proprietary manufacturer requirements and specifications; either at least once every 6 months or as per the specification, whichever is the shorter time period prescribed, to ensure they are not seized and are clear of debris and obstructions to free flow*."

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Solution: Our view is that it must be an automatic closing valve, and a backup system should also be available. BESS drainage details should therefore confirm that in the event of a fire, the penstock closing will be automated (i.e. set in the close position when fire water sprinklers/alarms are activated), thus preventing accidental discharge of fire water to the wider water environment. Details should also include installation of a backup system in case of power/automation failure - this could be a manually operated valve. If automatic valves are not to be used (which we advise against), an explanation of the procedure for closing valves and how risks of accidental release will be avoided must be provided. The Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan should include ongoing maintenance and testing of penstock valve(s) as traditional penstocks, when not operated for a long period of time, may seize up and thus be inoperable at times of emergency. Maintenance is discussed in the FBSMP, but penstocks and swales are not specifically mentioned. References to the penstock valve have been noted in paragraphs 4.3.7 and 4.5.5 of the FBSMP; paragraphs 4.1.9 and 4.11.5 of the FSWDS; paragraphs 9.6.69 of Chapter 9; and in Table 6 of the FOEMP. These will all need updating to clarify it will be an automatically closing valve.	The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is a secured DCO document, and as such will secure the requirement for ongoing maintenance of the penstock valve as above. The Framework BSMP is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the Environment Agency are a named consultee under sub-paragraph (4) of this Requirement, and as such the Environment Agency will have the opportunity to review the detailed BSMP prior to any approval.
	17	**EA17 – Use of gravel in drainage systems around BESS and substation** *(6.3 ES Appendix 9-D Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy **[APP-147]** – section 4.2.5;* *7.17 Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-198]** – section 4.5.5;* *6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – paragraphs 9.6.58 & 9.4.63)* Issue: Potential use of a gravel base within the impermeable lined drainage systems around BESS and substation sites. In particular, gravel can trap contaminants from firewater in sediment which is released into the environment after water is removed. Impact: Firewater and other chemicals from BESS pose an unacceptable risk to the water environment receptors and will deteriorate water quality unless it is contained sufficiently. In the event of a fire affecting the BESS or substation, there is the potential to mobilise pollutants in surface water runoff. If a gravel subbase is used, then contaminated material could be retained on their surface and may require the gravel to be cleaned or replaced in the event of a fire. Solution: Details should be added to the FBSMP to confirm that any Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) near the BESS or substation, which are designed to contain firewater runoff, will be impermeably lined. The Applicant must consider if a gravel subbase is the most appropriate design, and explain how it would be managed if contaminated material came into contact with it. If gravel substrates are deemed to be included in the final BESS design, there must be provision within the post-incident recovery plan that commits to removing the gravel to be cleaned and/or replaced.	In the event of a contamination incident, any areas of gravel within the BESS or On-site Substation compounds which have been contaminated will be dug out and replaced. This would be undertaken following any washing through of the gravel to remove contaminants to the basin to capture firewater runoff. Gravel is not proposed to be used within the lined attenuation basin. A soil layer above the liner will be used to sufficiently treat surface water runoff under normal operation of the SuDS. Contaminated soil would be isolated in the basin only and can be removed and replaced with clean, inert soil and the swale re-planted, following a fire. The Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** has been updated to reflect the fact that there would be removal and replacement of contaminated soil, and this will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 4.11.3 now reads: *The swale will then be cleaned of all contaminants including contaminated soils, and replaced with clean, inert soil and the swale re-planted."* The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** has been amended at paragraph 4.5.5 for clarity as follows: *"…where practical, at detailed design stage it is proposed that runoff from the battery storage area will be contained by local bunding and attenuated within ~~gravel subgrade of~~ the lined impermeable sustainable drainage system and attenuation swale (SuDS) features prior to being passed forward to the local land drainage network."* The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the Environment Agency are a named consultee under sub-

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Paragraph 9.6.58 of ES Chapter 9 states that swales around the BESS and Substation will "be lined with an impermeable membrane", which we agree with. However, paragraph 4.5.5 of the BSMP proposes that runoff from the battery storage area will be "attenuated within gravel subgrade of lined permeable sustainable drainage system and attenuation swale (SuDS)". Therefore, the lining of the swale is unclear, and any gravel substrate is at risk of contamination Where gravel is proposed to be used within an impermeable drainage basin, we ask the Applicant to demonstrate how they will manage accumulation of silt and pollutants within the base of the gravel. Contaminants from a fire event may accumulate in the gravel even if firewater runoff is identified as being suitable for release. These contaminants would then be released into the natural environment over longer periods of time. We note that paragraph 9.4.63 of ES Chapter 9 states that "The swale will then be cleaned of all contaminants", however it should be made clear that this may include removal and replacement of gravel.	paragraph (4) of this Requirement, and as such the Environment Agency will have the opportunity to review the detailed BSMP prior to any approval.
	18	**EA18 – BESS – firewater containment and disposal** *(7.17 Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-198]** – paragraphs 1.4.2 & 4.3.7; 6.3 ES Appendix 9-D Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy **[APP-147]** – paragraph 4.11.3)* Issue: Further information is required in relation to firewater containment and disposal in the event of a fire at the BESS. Paragraphs 1.4.2 and 4.3.7 of the Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) **[APP-198]**, and paragraph 4.11.3 of the Surface Water Drainage Strategy (SWDS) **[APP-147]** makes it clear that firewater runoff will be contained. Where the options are testing before release, or removal by tanker and treated offsite, we note that our preference is tankering away. For the testing and release option, further information on testing details should be contained within the BSMP. Impact: Firewater and other chemicals from BESS pose an unacceptable risk to the water environment receptors and will deteriorate water quality unless it is contained and removed sufficiently. Solution: In the event of a fire at the BESS, it is our preference for developers to opt for using tankers to remove any contaminated water offsite. However, if the treatment and discharge of firewater is being considered then we remind the Applicant that they would need to apply for an environmental permit. We request that methods and frequency of testing of contained surface runoff/ firewater be included in the final OEMP and BSMP. Testing is important to provide information around the quality of water that has been contained after a fire and will ascertain if it contains any contaminants and what level of risk to the water environment the contained firewater has. We expect that samples would be taken, when safe to do, which would be sent to a United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) accredited laboratory. The water samples should be checked against the list of surface water specific substances in the surface water pollution risk assessment guide. Further information is available on GOV.UK: Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit - GOV.UK.	Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** states that a tanker would be used to remove any contaminated water offsite in the event of a fire at the BESS, which aligns with the Environment Agency preference. This is stated in paragraph 9.4.63 of Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** as follows "*Provision of fire water containment (impermeable water capture to prevent used firewater reaching ground/the surrounding environment) is required. It is currently proposed to contain the external fire water runoff within lined swales surrounding the BESS areas, where it can be held and tested before either being released into the surrounding watercourses or to ground (if found to have no contaminants present, or contaminants that are within acceptable legal limits) or taken off site by a tanker for treatment elsewhere. The swale will then be cleaned of all contaminants. This is secured through the Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy (Appendix 9-D **[EN010154/APP/6.3]**)*". This is also covered in paragraph 4.11.3 of the Framework SWDS **[APP-147]**: *"It is proposed to contain the external fire water runoff within the swale surrounding the Solar Station Compounds, where it can be held and tested before either being released into the surrounding watercourses or to ground (if found to have no contaminants present, or contaminants that are within acceptable legal limits) or taken off site by a tanker for treatment elsewhere."* With regards to the Environment Agency's request for the inclusion of methodology/frequency of testing, the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** has been updated to reflect the Environment Agency requirements and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 4.5.5 now reads: "*Pollution analysis will always be conducted before removing from site (if polluted) or releasing into drainage systems, if safe to do so. Further details of the contaminant testing will be outlined in the final BSMP including details of the analytical suite and sampling frequency. Any release to the environment would also be subject to the requirements of an Environmental Permit*". . The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the Environment Agency are a named consultee under sub-paragraph (4) of this Requirement, and as such the Environment Agency will have the opportunity to review the detailed BSMP prior to any approval.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Given the timeframe to determine environmental permits we encourage applicants to engage with us on permit requirements at the earliest possible stage. Guidance in relation to discharging and permits is available at the following GOV.UK links: • Discharges to surface water and groundwater: environmental permits - GOV.UK • Get advice before you apply for an environmental permit - GOV.UK	
	19	**EA19 – Foul water strategy** *(6.3 ES Appendix 9-C Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** – paragraph 7.1.4;* *6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – paragraphs 9.4.14 & 9.4.65;* *6.3 ES Appendix 9-D Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy **[APP-147]** – paragraph 4.12.2)* Issue: Insufficient detail in relation to the foul water strategy, which is inconsistent between documents. Paragraph 7.1.4 of the Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** states that "drainage will be dealt with via a septic tank arrangement". Whereas paragraphs 9.4.14 and 9.4.65 of the ES Chapter 9 **[APP-034]**, and 4.12.2 of the Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy **[APP-147]** state that "the foul water flows will be dealt with via a sealed cesspit, i.e. with no overflow to ground pipe system." Impact: There is a requirement to ensure that foul water treatment and disposal is adequate to minimise risk to water quality. Solution: Foul water disposal strategy should be provided in more detail and documents should have continuity. Where septic tanks are used at the site, the Applicant should consider any potential impacts of discharge and confirm that a permit will be sought. Given the timeframe to determine environmental permits we encourage applicants to engage with us on permit requirements at the earliest possible stage. Further information is available on GOV.UK: Septic tanks and sewage treatment plants: what you need to do: Apply for a permit - GOV.UK We note that if a closed system is used, it is stated that it would be regularly emptied under contract with a registered recycling and waste management contractor. If road transport to an offsite disposal facility is required to remove foul then there should be regard for this within the waste management procedures.	When foul water is generated more than 30m from a public sewer location, the Applicant proposes to utilise a sealed cesspit system with no overflow system. This would be regularly emptied under contract by a registered recycling and waste management contractor. The Applicant has amended the Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** paragraph 7.1.4 for clarity (to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline) to now read: "*Foul drainage is not considered within the drainage strategy as no connection to the public sewer is proposed, drainage will be dealt with via a ~~septic tank~~ sealed cesspit arrangement or similar sealed system for the compound areas, emptied and maintained to recommended manufacturer advice.*" This amendment now ensures consistency between Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]**, Appendix 9-D Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** and Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**. The Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** sets out the provisions for the management of foul waste. As explained above, that waste will be managed by a registered recycling and waste management contractor. As such, there is no need for a further strategy to be provided.
	20	**EA20 – Wheel wash water** *(6.1 ES Chapter 3 The Proposed Development **[APP-028]** – section 3.4.27;* *6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]** – section 9.6.11;* *7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-189]**)* Issue: Paragraph 3.4.27 of the ES Chapter 3 **[APP-028]** states there will be "a self-contained wheel wash" and paragraph 9.6.11 of the ES Chapter 9 **[APP-034]** says that "Mud deposits will be controlled at entry and exit points to the Site using wheel washing facilities". Although this is repeated in the FCEMP too, there are no further details so it is unclear how this wheel wash water will be managed.	The exact approach to the isolation, treatment and disposal of wheel wash water will be determined by the appointed contractor. The contractor would be obliged to follow the requirements of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and the good practice guidance (GPG) contained therein (e.g., in relation to the adoption of the Considerate Contractors Scheme (see paragraph 2.10.1) which includes guidance regarding wheel washing, and also WAT-C2 which sets out the relevant GPG to be followed by the contractor) to prevent adverse impacts to the water environment. Further details would be set out in the detailed CEMP, which would be produced post-consent. The provision of the detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, is secured by Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Sub-paragraph (1) of this Requirement includes the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final CEMP.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Impact: Wheel wash water can contain sediments, but also contaminants from vehicles like hydrocarbons or metals, so must be adequately contained and disposed of to reduce risk of deteriorating water quality. Solution: The Applicant must confirm how wheel wash water will be contained, and how it will be treated and/or disposed of. The frequency of disposal and volumes of wheel wash water should also be considered. We acknowledge that the FCEMP **[APP-189]** includes wheel washing measures, however clarity on how it is intended on being isolated, treated and disposed of is required.	In order to ensure that the necessary further detail is provided within the detailed CEMP, WAT-C3 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated for clarity as per the below, and this will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline: *"h. Mud deposits will be controlled at entry and exit points to the DCO Site using wheel washing facilities and/or road sweepers operating during earthworks activities or other times as required. Potentially contaminated water from wheel washing facilities would be removed from site for disposal at an appropriate and licensed waste facility. Further details of how the wheel wash water would be isolated, treated and disposed of would be outlined within the detailed CEMP*".
	21	**EA21 – PFAS in PV cells** *(6.1 ES Chapter 3 The Proposed Development **[APP-028]**)* Issue: Paragraph 3.3.5 says that the photovoltaic (PV) cells will be "beneath a layer of toughened glass with an anti-reflective coating". Some PV cells are known to contain PFAS (per-and poly fluoroalkyl substances) in the materials or in any coating applied to the panels. Impact: PFAS are 'forever chemicals' that will negatively affect water quality, and can have health consequences if they enter drinking water. The risk the environment can be increased if panels are regularly washed to keep them clean, for maximum efficiency of energy generation. Solution: Check with panel manufacturers on the materials used, and determine if regular panel washing will occur during operation and maintenance phase which could introduce a pathway between the panels and water receptors of any chemicals in the coating. The FOEMP should be update as appropriate. We acknowledge that paragraph 3.5.14 states "no cleaning products would be used, only water" and that paragraph 9.4.61 states that "solar PV panels do not contain any liquid (hazardous or not) that could contaminate rainwater", however we still seek confirmation regarding PFAS.	The supplier and make of solar PV panels that will be used for the Proposed Development has not yet been chosen – this approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV technologies are constantly evolving, and new efficiencies are developed regularly. However, it can be confirmed that any PV cells to be used will be PFAS-free. To ensure this measure is secured, the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** have been updated (to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline) at Works No.1 (design) to note: *"The solar PV cells will be PFAS (per-and poly fluoroalkyl substances) free".* Requirement 6(2) in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** requires the design of the Proposed Development to be in accordance with the design commitments.
	22	**EA22 – Storage of waste batteries** *(7.17 Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-198]** – paragraph 2.5.11;* *7.8 Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-190]** – Table 13, ID: MW-O1)* Issue: Potential for contaminant leakage from stored waste batteries prior to disposal. Also, defective batteries carry a higher risk of fire based on those stored at waste sites in the county. Impact: Risk of pollution to land and controlled waters. Solution: The Applicant should ensure that waste and/or damaged BESS batteries are stored and managed such that they do not pose a contamination risk. For example, this could be due to chemical leakage, or fire water runoff in the event of extinguishing a waste battery fire.	As noted in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (ref. paragraph 3.2.18(b)): *"The supplying manufacturer will have obligations under the Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (as amended) (or such equivalent regulations in force at the time of decommissioning) and will be contractually obliged to offer a recycling service."* The potential for contaminant leakage from stored waste batteries prior to disposal is acknowledged. The appropriate bunding and further design of the temporary storage area for batteries will be developed at the detailed design stage to ensure that stored waste batteries do not pose a contamination risk to the environment. These Environment Agency requirements will be included within an updated Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** which will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 3.2.16 now includes the following wording: "*If removal of waste batteries straight away is not possible, waste and/or damaged batteries will be stored in a bunded area with fire detection prior to removal. Full details of the proposed arrangement will be provided in the detailed Battery Safety Management Plan*".

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Waste batteries need to be stored in a bunded area, ideally with fire detection. The FBSMP **[APP-198]** does not discuss storage conditions for defective or damaged batteries which have been removed from service. However, in the FOEMP **[APP-190]**, Table 13, ID MW-O1, the applicant states that they do not propose to store waste batteries on site, but batteries will be removed "straight away". Should this not be possible for any reason, suitable protection measures must be in place. Any temporary holding area for batteries awaiting loading for removal should be suitable to avoid presenting a contamination risk. The applicant should also note that stored damaged batteries are susceptible to spontaneous combustion. In paragraph 2.5.11 of the FBSMP **[APP-198]** it states: "A fire watch will be present until all potentially damaged BESS equipment batteries are removed from the area following a fire event." We strongly recommend this applies to all waste batteries, stored for any reason, if applicable. Removal of waste batteries "straight away" is unlikely to occur as there are no battery storage or treatment sites near the location. Weekly or monthly collections by the waste company is more likely. Therefore, temporary storage will need to be considered.	Measure MW-O1 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** has also been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to clarify this. Measure MW-O1 now reads: "It is not proposed to store waste batteries on site. They will be removed from the containers and taken away straight away, following waste duty of care. *If removal of waste batteries straight away is not possible, waste and/or damaged batteries will be stored in a bunded area with fire detection prior to removal."* The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** and Framework BSMP **[APP198]** are to be developed into a final OEMP and a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the respective Framework Plans, as secured under Requirement 13 and Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. Requirement 13(1) and Requirement 7(4) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** include the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final OEMP and detailed BSMP, respectively.
	23	**EA23 – Water supply assessment and strategy** *(6.5 Environmental Commitments Register (Rev 1) **[APP-183]**;* *6.1 ES Chapter 3 The Proposed Development **[APP-028]** – paragraph 3.3.40* *6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]**;* *3.3 Consents Agreement and Position Statement (Rev 1) **[APP-182]**)* Issue: Insufficient information regarding water supply demands. We are aware that a water resources assessment has been undertaken and submitted to Anglian Water (Table 9-2 in 6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment **[APP-034]**), but this does not appear to have been submitted with the DCO application. Impact: In the absence of an adequate assessment of water usage demands and a satisfactory strategy for water supply, there is a risk that this could impact the project. If the water resources assessment undertaken does not include all water demands, and water is required outside of mains water supply then alternative sources of supply should be evaluated. Solution: The water resources assessment undertaken should be submitted as a DCO application document and be made available for review. The Environment agency seeks confidence that water demands can be met sustainably and feasibly and that all demands have been considered. The Environment Agency also seeks assurances that pressure on water company supply is mitigated as much as possible through water efficiency measures and consideration for the use of non-potable water (e.g. rainwater harvesting) for purposes that do not require it. It is acknowledged that Anglian Water have confirmed that volumes of water can be supplied for the proposed development to include water demands additional to welfare station supply during construction. However, there is a discrepancy in the adequate water supply described for dust suppression in Air quality and Environmental commitments register as coming from non-potable sources on this basis.	The Water Resources Assessment (WRA) developed for Anglian Water includes best estimates of water use at the time of the DCO submission, including water requirements for domestic purposes during construction and operation, as well as non-domestic purposes. The WRA will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline and has since been issued to the Environment Agency for review. The Environment Agency responded with comments on the WRA, noting that until the Applicant can confirm that Anglian Water can supply sufficient water to meet all construction demands, the Environment Agency does not have confidence that a sustainable and practical water supply is available to the Proposed Development. The Applicant subsequently discussed the quantities estimated for Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) in relation to the Proposed Development with Anglian Water, whereby Anglian Water confirmed that the required water supply during construction (including HDD quantities) and operation of the Proposed Development can be supplied. This confirmation from Anglian Water was sent to the Environment Agency, who subsequently responded on 15 January 2026 to confirm that the Environment Agency is satisfied that this additional information resolves any uncertainty. Further discussion with the Environment Agency on this topic will be considered and responded to as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), where the SoCG will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The WRA estimates that water use during construction will include water needed for wheel washers, dust suppression and possible concrete preparation (should this take place on site). Estimates of water volumes required for HDD (and associated bentonite clay mixing) were not included in the WRA as this is subject to further input from the contractor once appointed. However, the need for this HDD water was highlighted to Anglian Water within the WRA, and subsequently discussed, whereby (as noted above) Anglian Water confirmed that the required water supply during construction (including HDD quantities) of the Proposed Development can be supplied. In terms of water efficiency measures, the WRA outlines the measures committed to by the Applicant to ensure that water use for the construction, operation and decommissioning stages of the Proposed Development will be as efficient as possible, including the use of rainwater harvesting and use of water efficiency measures on welfare facilities. These measures will be further developed at the detailed design stage and are captured within management plans such

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Paragraph 3.3.40 of '6.1 ES Chapter 3 The Proposed Development' **[APP-028]** describes cooling in the control measures for the BESS, however further detail of the design is not apparent or if a water supply is required. Mains water has been identified as supply for some non-domestic water uses, such as bentonite clay mixing for drilling fluids. However, this is not described in the estimated volumes described in paragraph 9.6.46.	as the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. CC-O3 and WAT-O7), in addition to commitments with regards to the Water Management Plan within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. In response to the WRA submission, Anglian Water confirmed that they are able to provide the Applicant with sufficient water to meet all of the outlined requirements (both domestic and non-domestic) during construction and during operation. With regards to the discrepancy noted for dust suppression water coming from non-potable sources, the reference to this source within Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** and the Environmental Commitments Register **[APP-183]** relates to the standard IAQM 'High' risk site guidance. Note, this measure is secured via the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. AQ-C1) – i.e. "*Ensure an adequate water supply on the site for effective dust/particulate matter suppression/ mitigation, using non-potable water where possible and appropriate*." As such, it is anticipated that non-potable sources would be utilised for dust suppression "*where possible and appropriate*", however in order to generate a conservative water supply estimate, water for dust suppression has also been included in the WRA. Therefore, this is not considered a discrepancy, but an assumption to allow for robust estimates to be generated regarding potential water supply needs. Given the commitment to rainwater harvesting noted above, it is likely to be the case that the volume of water required from Anglian Water is less than that which has been included within the WRA. With regards to the description of cooling in the control measures for the BESS within paragraph 3.3.40 of Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, this is in reference to the heating and cooling of the battery system, as further discussed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (e.g., ref. paragraph 2.6.1). As noted in paragraph 2.6.1(a), heating and cooling of the battery modules will be provided by an independent liquid cooling system, and as such is not reliant upon a water supply.
	24	**EA24 – Waste classification and soil reuse** *(6.1 ES Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]** – 14.5 Materials and Waste, section 14.5.75)* Issue: Waste classification and soil reuse is not adequately understood. Impact: Waste soil exported off site without proper classification or possible sham disposal of soil on site (kept for reuse, but then not reused and left in piles around the site). Solution: Provide further details regarding waste classification and soil reuse. Please refer to additional comments. Waste soil must be classified, including chemical testing and interpretation of those results. Failure to do this will mean that the soil must be coded EWC170503* which is a hazardous waste code with obvious cost implications. Any soil kept on site for re-use under the Definition of Waste: Code of Practice (DoW:CoP) would not necessarily require further testing unless previous ground investigation results indicate issues. However, soil kept under the DoW:CoP must have a 'certainty of use' to be covered by it. If not used during the construction any remaining piles would need to be classified and disposed of. Please also refer to our informative comments on soil management in Appendix B of this response.	As outlined in Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]**, a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) (to be included as part of the detailed CEMP, as secured by the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**) will be prepared by the Principal Contractor as part of the detailed CEMP to be produced. This will provide information on waste classification; however, the Applicant acknowledges that this isn't explicitly specified. As such, measure MW-C1 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated, and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, to clarify this point. Measure MW-C1 now includes the following wording with regards to the requirements of the SWMP: "*v. provide information on waste classification.*" As outlined in Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** (ref. paragraph 14.5.60), the Principal Contractor will determine whether excavated material use will be undertaken via a waste framework directive exclusion, exemption, CL:AIRE DoW CoP Materials Management Plan or Environmental Permit. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated for clarity and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Measure MW-C1 now includes the following wording in this regard: "*The Principal Contractor will determine whether excavated material use will be undertaken via a waste framework directive exclusion, exemption, CL:AIRE DoW CoP Materials Management Plan or Environmental Permit.*" The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** is to be developed into a detailed CEMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, as secured under Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
			Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Sub-paragraph (1) of this Requirement includes the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final CEMP.
	25	**1.0 Flood Risk Sequential Test** We note that the Applicant has addressed the need for the Sequential Test in section 6 of the Flood Risk Assessment (6.3 ES Appendix 9-C) **[APP-146]**. It is not our role to determine whether or not the Sequential Test has been passed, that is for the decision maker.	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that it is for the decision maker to determine whether the Sequential Test has been passed.
	26	**2.0 Flood Risk Exception Test** We note that the Applicant has addressed the need for the Exception Test in section 6 of the Flood Risk Assessment (6.3 ES Appendix 9-C) **[APP-146]**. The exception test is in two parts, described in paragraph 5.8.11 of the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1) and paragraph 178 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In order for the test to be passed it must be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Paragraph 5.8.11 of NPS EN-1 and paragraph 179 of the NPPF make clear that both parts need to be met for the test to be satisfied. It is for the Applicant to demonstrate this. The Environment Agency provide advice on the second part of the test (part b), but it is for the decision maker to consider the first part of the test, accounting for the findings of the flood risk assessment and our flood risk advice, and to determine whether the test, overall, has been satisfied.	The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges that the decision maker will consider the first part of the Exception Test, accounting for the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** and the Environment Agency's flood risk advice, to determine whether the test, overall, has been satisfied.
	27	**3.0 Fish Rescue** Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Table 3 – When applying for a FR2 licence (Application for authorisation to use fishing instruments other than rod and line in England), the Applicant should ensure an adequate method statement of the intended work is submitted. This should consider fish welfare, appropriate equipment and competence of contractors undertaking fish rescues.	The Applicant notes this comment. If an FR2 permit is required, the application will include the required information, including an adequate method statement considering the relevant factors. It is noted that any application for a FR2 permit would be submitted to the Environment Agency, and as such additional details can be requested at that stage if required/relevant.
	28	**4.0 Cable trench width discrepancy** In paragraph 3.3.42 (and 9.6.19) of the ES Chapter 3 The Proposed Development **[APP-028]**, it states medium voltage cable trenches "will typically be up to 1m wide". In Table 3-5 (and paragraph 9.6.50), it states medium voltage cable trenches will be "1.2–5m wide". This is a large difference. Wider trenches could have greater impact on surface and groundwater and soils. We recommend the Applicant checks and updates the report to ensure consistency throughout. Similarly, in paragraph 3.3.54 it states the grid connection cable will be in a trench up to 4.5m wide, but in paragraph 3.3.55 (and 9.6.18), it states the same trench will be approximately 3m wide.	Paragraph 3.3.42 of Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** refers to the "typical" trench width for onsite cabling (i.e., the trench width typically implemented across similar schemes for onsite cabling), whereby the width of the trench will be dependent upon factors such as method of installation, ground conditions and number of cables laid in parallel (as noted in the paragraph). Table 3-5 of Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** relates to the design parameters for the onsite cabling – as noted in paragraph 3.2.5 of Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, the use of 'design parameters' is adopted to present a likely worst-case assessment of potential environmental effects of elements of the Proposed Development that require flexibility, hence the difference in quoted widths (i.e. a typical width and a maximum width). The use of design parameters allows a reasonable worst-case assessment to be undertaken within the ES technical assessments in line with the Rochdale Envelope approach, as discussed in Section 5.3 of Chapter 5:

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
			Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**. As such, the assessment has been undertaken assuming the maximum width stated as opposed to the 'typical' width. Paragraph 9.6.19 of Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** provides an overview of the typical cabling widths, replicating the text in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** for context for the reader. Paragraph 9.6.50(d) of Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** then reflects the design parameters – i.e., the trench width for onsite cabling that has been assumed for assessment purposes. It should be noted that the design parameters regarding onsite cabling reported in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** are also set out in the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** document (ref. Page 15). Compliance with the Proposed Design Parameters is secured in Requirement 6(2) of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Similarly, paragraph 3.3.55 of Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** refers to the "approximate" 3m wide trench width for the 400kV Grid Connection Cable (i.e., the trench width typically implemented across similar schemes for 400kV cabling). Paragraph 9.6.18 of Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** replicates this text in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** for context for the reader regarding the approximate width of the Grid Connection Cable trench. The reference to "trench of up to 4.5m wide" in paragraph 3.3.54 of Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** then relates to the maximum trench width assumed for the 400kV Grid Connection Cable. This trench width for the 400kV Grid Connection Cable has been assumed in the assessment presented in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**. Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to clarify this assumption. Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** paragraph 9.6.50(d) now states: *"Grid connection cable - for open trench excavation, up to 3m below ground level subject to design and ground conditions, with a minimum cover of 0.9m for the cable and a trench width of up to 4.5m. For horizontal directional drilling, a minimum 5m depth under the River Brant would be required, with final depth subject to design and ground conditions. Jointing bays will be required up to 1,000m apart to join sections of cable together. The dimensions of the jointing bay would be up to 21m in length by 3m in width by 2.5m in depth."* Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, Table 3-7 has also been updated, and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, to clarify this design parameter. The applicable design parameter now notes: "*For open trench excavation, up to 3m below ground level subject to design and ground conditions, with a minimum cover of 0.9m for the cable and a trench width of up to 4.5m."* It should be noted that these clarifications do not affect the assessments or conclusions presented in the ES, whereby, as noted above, the ES technical assessments have been undertaken in line with the Rochdale Envelope approach, as discussed in Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**.
	29	**5.0 Source Protection Zone 3** In the Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 14-C) **[APP-170]**, paragraph 9.5.2 and Table 13, Source Protection Zone 3 is not listed as a controlled waters receptor. We raised this issue in our PEIR (statutory pre-application) consultation response. As this is a conceptual site model of the site, it is important that it includes all receptors. Other documents within this submission have been updated accordingly and there is sufficient discussion elsewhere. However, we advise that submitted documents should be consistent with each other to ensure clarity.	Paragraph 9.5.2 and Table 13 in the Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (Appendix 14-C of the ES) **[APP-170]** include Secondary A, Secondary B and Principal Aquifers within the controlled waters receptors. Further details of the hydrogeological setting of the Order Limits are provided in Chapter 3.3 Hydrogeology, where in paragraphs 3.3.4 and 3.3.5 under the heading of 'Source Protection Zones and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones for Groundwater', it has been identified that the eastern part of the Cable Corridor is within a Zone III (Total Catchment) SPZ. The risk to the SPZ is considered within R5, 'Water Environment, Aquifers' in Tables 13, 18 and 19 in the Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment **[APP-170]**. As such, whilst the Zone III SPZ is not listed as a separate controlled waters receptor in paragraph 9.5.2 and Table 13 of the

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
			Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment **[APP-170]**, it is captured within receptor R5 'Water Environment, Aquifers'.
	30	**6.0 Off-site controlled waters receptors** Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 14-C) **[APP-170]**, paragraphs 9.5.5 to 9.5.7 – Controlled waters (surface water and groundwater, including source protection zones) off-site might be affected by contamination within, or migrating through, the Order Limits. While some of these are given as an on-site receptor, the Applicant should consider also including them in this list for completeness. However, other documents within this submission have sufficient discussion of these receptors. We advise that submitted documents should be consistent with each other to ensure clarity.	Paragraph 9.5.2 in the Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (Appendix 14-C of the ES) **[APP-170]** includes the controlled waters receptors of groundwater and surface water under the heading of 'On-site Receptors'. It is acknowledged that these receptors are not repeated within the 'Off-site Receptors' sub-section, however it is confirmed that within Tables 13, 18 and 19 the assessments for controlled water receptors R5 Aquifers and R6 Surface Waters cover both on and off-site.
	31	**7.0 Soil management** Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 14-C) **[APP-170]**, paragraphs 15.1.2 to 15.1.5 – We previously commented on the lack of clarity of the scope of this ground investigation (PEIR response comment E6). The Applicant proposes to use the results of the investigation to inform soil re-use following CL:AIRE DoW:CoP. This can only be done where soil chemistry has been tested. The Applicant may not have enough information to classify and reuse soils from outside areas within the scope of the DCO Site Investigation. We are pleased to note the ground investigation is included in the Environmental Commitments Register **[APP-183]** and FCEMP **[APP-189]**. In these documents, it states the scope will be discussed with the Environment Agency prior to commencement and we look forward to seeing this in due course.	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that soil re-use following CL:AIRE DoW:CoP can only be applied where chemical analysis of soils within the Order Limits Investigation has been carried out. As noted within this response, the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** secures this requirement at measure MW-C1. Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Environment Agency is a prescribed consultee in respect of the final CEMP
	32	**8.0 Removal of cables when decommissioning** Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) **[APP-191]**, paragraph 2.3.2 – The Applicant's commitment to remove all cables within the Source Protection Zone 3, or where the site is underlain by principal aquifer, is not repeated in this section. For completeness, it would be valuable for the information to be included here. We acknowledge that the information is given in Table 4 ID: WAT- D1, and in other documents.	The Applicant notes this comment – paragraph 2.3.2 of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to provide clarity on this. Paragraph 2.3.2 now reads: *"When the operational phase ends, the Proposed Development will require decommissioning. During decommissioning, all infrastructure associated with the Proposed Development will be removed and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time. This is with the exception of the majority of cabling and/or cable ducting in the Cable Corridor, which may remain in-situ – note, as per Environment Agency requirements, all cables and subsurface infrastructure will be removed where they are located within an SPZ or areas of Principal aquifer. The mode of cable decommissioning for the Cable Corridor and interconnecting cables will be dependent upon government policy and best practice at that time. Currently, some local authorities consider the most environmentally acceptable option to be leaving the cables or cable ducting in situ, as this avoids disturbance to overlying land and habitats and to neighbouring communities. Alternatively, the cables or cable ducting can be removed by opening the ground at regular intervals and pulling the cable through to the extraction point, avoiding the need to open up the entire length of the cable route."* The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** is to be developed into a final DEMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, as secured under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Under sub-paragraph (2) of this Requirement, the Environment Agency is a prescribed consultee in respect of the final DEMP.
	33	**9.0 Water Management Plan – water quality monitoring**	The Applicant notes the suggestions regarding measures to be captured within the Water Management Plan. As noted in paragraph 4.1.2 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, a Water Management Plan is secured by the Framework CEMP and will be produced as part of the

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
		Throughout ES Chapter 9 **[APP-034]**, and Environmental Management Plans, it is suggested that water quality monitoring will be undertaken prior to, during, and following on from the construction activity, which we support. However, there is no detail provided about any proposed monitoring. If a monitoring plan is not suitably designed then it may not be able to detect relevant trends, if any, on water quality during the construction and operation phases. There will be some monitoring during the first few months of operation to provide confirmation that there is no residual water quality impacts post-construction. We recognise that details of monitoring will be set out within the Water Management Plan (in the CEMP) post-consent, therefore we will look forward to reviewing the documents and providing further comments at that stage. In the meantime, see below for what we would expect to be included in a monitoring programme. The monitoring locations must include upstream and downstream of any proposed surface water outfalls and water crossings. With regard to frequency, we recommend at least once per month, which should start at least six months prior to construction. During construction, we suggest the frequency of sampling should increase during the first three months of construction, and during any earthworks or concrete work (i.e. every two weeks). Monitoring should continue monthly all throughout construction, and for six months after construction too. The monitoring plan should include enough monitoring samples to detect any variation as a result of seasons or weather conditions.	detailed CEMP. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** is to be developed into a final CEMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, as secured under Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.The Environment Agency are listed as a named consultee for the discharge of Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, and as such will have the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Water Management Plan produced post consent as part of the detailed CEMP prior to any approval.
	34	**10.0 Pond near centralised BESS** Figure 3-5 Indicative Centralised BESS Layout **[APP-051]** suggests that there is a pond at the end of the proposed BESS. This must be impermeably lined, and we recommend that the FBSMP **[APP-198]** and FSWDS **[APP-147]** explain how this feature is a managed to ensure that there is no risk from firewater runoff, given its proximity.	It should be noted that Figure 3-5: Indicative Centralised BESS Layout of the ES **[APP-051]** is an indicative layout, and as such there is no commitment to position a pond at the location shown on this figure – the final location of any drainage features will be set out within the detailed design and the detailed SWDS, in line with the relevant controls of the Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** and Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. As noted above, any fire water that collects in the lined swales would be tested and if found to be contaminated, it would be pumped out by a suitable contractor for off-site disposal at a licenced waste facility. The swale would then be cleaned of all contaminants. If the collected water was not contaminated, it would be released, with the agreement of the Environment Agency if a permit was required. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** includes the requirement for regular inspection and maintenance of the SuDS to ensure performance is maintained as expected throughout the operation phase. As noted above, the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** has been amended at paragraph 4.5.5 to clarify the nature of the impermeable lining of the basin as follows: *"…where practical, at detailed design stage it is proposed that runoff from the battery storage area will be contained by local bunding and attenuated within ~~gravel subgrade of~~ the lined impermeable sustainable drainage system and attenuation swale (SuDS) features prior to being passed forward to the local land drainage network."* The Framework SWDS **[APP-147]**, Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** and Framework BSMP **[APP198]** are to be developed into a final/detailed plans, substantially in accordance with the respective Framework plans, as secured under Requirements 10, 12, 13 and 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. The four Requirements referred to above include the Environment Agency as a prescribed consultee in respect of these final/detailed plans.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Environment Agency Relevant Representation	Response to Environment Agency Relevant Representation
	35	**11.0 The control of emissions from Non-Road Going Mobile Machinery** Where development involves the use of any non-road going mobile machinery with a net rated power of 37kW and up to 560kW, that is used during site preparation, construction, demolition, and/ or operation, at that site, we strongly recommend that the machinery used shall meet or exceed the latest emissions standards set out in Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 (as amended). This shall apply to the point that the machinery arrives on site, regardless of it being hired or purchased, unless agreed in writing with the LPA. This is particularly important for major residential, commercial, or industrial development located in or within 2km of an Air Quality Management Area for oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), and or particulate matter that has an aerodynamic diameter of 10 or 2.5 microns (PM10 and PM2.5). Use of low emission technology will improve or maintain air quality and support LPAs and developers in improving and maintaining local air quality standards and support their net zero objectives. We also advise, the item(s) of machinery must also be registered (where a register is available) for inspection by the appropriate Competent Authority (CA), which is usually the local authority. The requirement to include this may already be required by a policy in the local plan or strategic spatial strategy document. The Environment Agency can also require this same standard to be applied to sites which it regulates. To avoid dual regulation this informative should only be applied to the site preparation, construction, and demolition phases at sites that may require an environmental permit. Non-Road Mobile Machinery includes items of plant such as bucket loaders, forklift trucks, excavators, 360 grab, mobile cranes, machine lifts, generators, static pumps, piling rigs etc. The Applicant should be able to state or confirm the use of such machinery in their application to which this then can be applied.	The Applicant recognises the importance of minimising emissions from Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) during site preparation, construction, and demolition phases, particularly for developments located within or adjacent to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). There are no AQMAs designated within the NKDC's administrative boundary; the Proposed Development is not located within 2km of an AQMA. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** does not currently specify that machinery must meet or exceed the latest emissions standards. However, it does include a requirement to develop and implement a Dust Management Plan (DMP) as part of the detailed CEMP (ref. AQ-C1). This plan may incorporate measures to control other emissions and will be subject to approval by the Local Authority. The level of detail will be proportionate to the assessed risk and will, as a minimum, include the highly recommended measures for an Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) "High Risk Site," in accordance with IAQM Guidance[2] on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction. The Applicant considers that these measures will ensure NRMM emissions are effectively controlled so that they will not result in significant adverse impacts on local air quality.
	36	**12.0 Environmental Commitments Register – reference numbers (formatting suggestion)** In the Environmental Commitments Register **[APP-183]**, it would be useful if commitments were given a reference number, or other identification, so it is easier to refer to specific lines in the table.	This suggestion is noted, however the Environmental Commitments Register **[APP-183]** provides a wayfinding document to refer the reader to the securing mechanism (e.g. the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**) for the relevant mitigation measures established within the ES. This includes specific ID references for each mitigation measure, so that these measures can be easily looked up within the relevant management plans. By further adding reference numbers to each of the environmental commitments this would be double-referencing the mitigation measures, and as such is not considered necessary.

2.2 Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

Table 2-2: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
RR-205	1	As the Promoter proposes to compulsorily acquire new rights over land in which Network Rail has rights, and the Promoter extinguish, suspend or otherwise interfere with such rights, Network Rail hereby objects to the making of the Order in principle on the ground that the	The Applicant notes this objection by Network Rail. To enable Network Rail to withdraw its objection to the Proposed Development, the Applicant is seeking to engage with Network Rail, through their solicitors, in order to agree the relevant protections in favour of Network Rail, and to enter into an agreement to ensure that the new rights sought by the Applicant is exercised in a

[2] The Institute of Air Quality Management (2024) Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
		powers sought are may interfere with the safe and efficient operation of the Railway and could cause a serious detriment to the carrying on of Network Rail's statutory undertaking. In order for Network Rail to be in a position to withdraw its objection Network Rail will require: 1. adequate protective provisions to be included within the Order (and for the avoidance of doubt Network Rail require these Protective Provisions to be in the form set out at Appendix 1 to this Relevant Representation); and 2. an agreement with the Promoter to ensure that the new rights sought are exercised in regulated manner to prevent adverse impacts to Network Rail's ability to comply with its liabilities and obligations. Network Rail is continuing to review the Promoter's plans, draft Order and application documents, and will continue to work constructively with the Promoter to clarify any issues raised. The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State will need to be satisfied that railway safety and operations will not be compromised by the making of the Order.	way which will prevent adverse impacts on Network Rail's interest in the relevant Plots of land and its ability to comply with its liabilities and obligations. The Applicant understands that the areas of land within the Order Limits within which Network Rail may have an interest are limited to Plots 13/3 and 13/6, within which Network Rail has the benefit of restrictive covenants and easements, and rights to access respectively. The Applicant has previously made enquiries with Network Rail as to whether it has any interest in an unregistered Plot 13/5 to which no response was received. The Applicant has followed up with Network Rail to understand if Network Rail does also have an interest in Plot 13/5 and a response is awaited. Plot 13/5 relates to a small section of disused railway. The Applicant understands that the Proposed Development is unlikely to interfere with the safe and efficient operation of the Railway due to the limited extent of Network Rail's land interests within the Order Limits. Substantive discussions in relation to Protective Provisions are yet to take place; however, the Applicant is actively seeking engagement from Network Rail to progress these matters. The Applicant has sought to establish communication with Network Rail, both directly and via its legal representatives on a significant number of occasions. Attempts to seek engagement date back to December 2024 with several emails having been sent that month. Following this, in the months leading up to submission of the DCO Application in July 2025, the Applicant sent ten emails, with a similar number having been sent since submission. Despite this, the Applicant is yet to receive any clarification from Network Rail as to the extent of its land interests within the Order Limits even though the Applicant has explicitly set out what it believes to be the extent of Network Rail's land interests and asked for specific clarification of this.
	2	**Appendix 1 Protective Provisions for the benefit of Network Rail** Schedule 14 Part 3 Protective Provisions for the Protection of Railways Interests 1. The provisions of this Part of this Schedule have effect, unless otherwise agreed in writing between the undertaker and Network Rail and, in the case of paragraph 15 of this Part of this Schedule any other person on whom rights or obligations are conferred by that paragraph.	The Applicant's position is that protective provisions for the benefit of Network Rail are not required on the basis of the limited, if any, active rail infrastructure within the Order Limits, as set out above. The Applicant is willing to enter into an agreement in order to provide protection to Network Rail's historic land interests and a response on this proposal is awaited from Network Rail. Where Network Rail has raised specific technical points in the form of their Protective Provisions, the Applicant has responded to these below.
	3	2. In this Part of this Schedule— "asset protection agreement" means an agreement to regulate the construction and maintenance of the specified work in a form prescribed from time to time by Network Rail; "construction" includes execution, placing, alteration and reconstruction and "construct" and "constructed" have corresponding meanings; "the engineer" means an engineer appointed by Network Rail for the purposes of this Order; "network licence" means the network licence, as the same is amended from time to time, granted to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited by the Secretary of State in exercise of their powers under section 8 (licences) of the Railways Act 1993; "Network Rail" means Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 02904587, whose registered office is at Waterloo General Office, London SE1 8SW) and any associated company of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited which holds property for railway purposes, and for the purpose of this definition "associated company" means any company which is (within the meaning of section 1159 of the Companies Act 2006) the holding company of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, a subsidiary of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited or another subsidiary of the holding company of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited and any successor to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited's railway undertaking; "plans" includes sections, designs, design data, software, drawings, specifications, soil reports, calculations,	

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
		descriptions (including descriptions of methods of construction), staging proposals, programmes and details of the extent, timing and duration of any proposed occupation of railway property; "railway operational procedures" means procedures specified under any access agreement (as defined in the Railways Act 1993) or station lease; "railway property" means any railway belonging to Network Rail and- (a) any station, land, works, apparatus and equipment belonging to Network Rail or connected with any such railway; and (b) any easement or other property interest held or used by Network Rail or a tenant or licencee of Network Rail for the purposes of such railway or works, apparatus or equipment; "regulatory consents" means any consent or approval required under: (a) the Railways Act 1993; (b) the network licence; and/or (c) any other relevant statutory or regulatory provisions; by either the Office of Rail and Road or the Secretary of State for Transport or any other competent body including change procedures and any other consents, approvals of any access or beneficiary that may be required in relation to the authorised development; "specified work" means so much of any of the authorised development as is situated upon, across, under, over or within 15 metres of, or may in any way adversely affect, railway property and, for the avoidance of doubt, includes the maintenance of such works under the powers conferred by article 5 (maintenance of authorised development) in respect of such works.	
	4	3. (1) Where under this Part of this Schedule Network Rail is required to give its consent or approval in respect of any matter, that consent or approval is subject to the condition that Network Rail complies with any relevant railway operational procedures and any obligations under its network licence or under statute. (2) In so far as any specified work or the acquisition or use of railway property is or may be subject to railway operational procedures, Network Rail must— (a) co-operate with the undertaker with a view to avoiding undue delay and securing conformity as between any plans approved by the engineer and requirements emanating from those procedures; and (b) use their reasonable endeavours to avoid any conflict arising between the application of those procedures and the proper implementation of the authorised development pursuant to this Order.	
	5	4. (1)The undertaker must not exercise the powers conferred by— (a) article 3 (development consent etc granted by the Order); (b) article 5 (power to maintain the authorised development); (c) article 17 (discharge of water); (d) article 18 (authority to survey and investigate the land); (e) article 19 (compulsory acquisition of land); (f) article 22 (compulsory acquisition of rights); (g) article 23 (private rights); (h) article 25 (acquisition of subsoil only); (i) article 26 (power to override easements and other rights); (j) article 29 (temporary use of land for constructing the authorised development); (k) article 30 (temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development); (l) article 31 (statutory undertakers); (m) article 39 (felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows);	

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
		(n) the powers conferred by section 11(3) (power of entry) of the 1965 Act; (o) the powers conferred by section 203 (power to override easements and rights) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016; (p) the powers conferred by section 172 (right to enter and survey land) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016; (q) any powers under in respect of the temporary possession of land under the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017; in respect of any railway property unless the exercise of such powers is with the consent of Network Rail. (2) The undertaker must not in the exercise of the powers conferred by this Order prevent pedestrian or vehicular access to any railway property, unless preventing such access is with the consent of Network Rail. (3) The undertaker must not exercise the powers conferred by sections 271 or 272 of the 1990 Act, article 31 (statutory undertakers), article 26 (power to override easements and other rights) or article 23 (private rights), in relation to any right of access of Network Rail to railway property, but such right of access may be diverted with the consent of Network Rail. (4) The undertaker must not under the powers of this Order acquire or use or acquire new rights over, or seek to impose any restrictive covenants over, any railway property, or extinguish any existing rights of Network Rail in respect of any third party property, except with the consent of Network Rail. (5) The undertaker must not under the powers of this Order do anything which would result in railway property being incapable of being used or maintained or which would affect the safe running of trains on the railway. (6) Where Network Rail is asked to give its consent pursuant to this paragraph, such consent must not be unreasonably withheld but may be given subject to reasonable conditions but it shall never be unreasonable to withhold consent for reasons of operational or railway safety (such matters to be in Network Rail's absolute discretion). (7) The undertaker must enter into an asset protection agreement prior to the carrying out of any specified work.	
	6	5. (1) The undertaker must before commencing construction of any specified work supply to Network Rail proper and sufficient plans of that work for the reasonable approval of the engineer and the specified work must not be commenced except in accordance with such plans as have been approved in writing by the engineer or settled by arbitration. (2) The approval of the engineer under sub-paragraph (1) must not be unreasonably withheld, and if by the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which such plans have been supplied to Network Rail the engineer has not intimated their disapproval of those plans and the grounds of such disapproval the undertaker may serve upon the engineer written notice requiring the engineer to intimate approval or disapproval within a further period of 28 days beginning with the date upon which the engineer receives written notice from the undertaker. If by the expiry of the further 28 days the engineer has not intimated approval or disapproval, the engineer shall be deemed to have approved the plans as submitted. (3) If by the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which written notice was served upon the engineer under sub-paragraph (2), Network Rail gives notice to the undertaker that Network Rail desires itself to construct any part of a specified work which in the opinion of the engineer will or may affect the stability of railway property or the safe operation of traffic on the railways of Network Rail then, if the undertaker desires such part of the specified work to be constructed, Network Rail must construct it without unnecessary delay on behalf of and to the reasonable satisfaction of the undertaker in accordance with the	

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
		plans approved or deemed to be approved or settled under this paragraph, and under the supervision (where appropriate and if given) of the undertaker. (4) When signifying their approval of the plans the engineer may specify any protective works (whether temporary or permanent) which in the engineer's opinion should be carried out before the commencement of the construction of a specified work to ensure the safety or stability of railway property or the continuation of safe and efficient operation of the railways of Network Rail or the services of operators using the same (including any relocation de-commissioning and removal of works, apparatus and equipment necessitated by a specified work and the comfort and safety of passengers who may be affected by the specified works), and such protective works as may be reasonably necessary for those purposes must be constructed by Network Rail or by the undertaker, if Network Rail so desires, and such protective works must be carried out at the expense of the undertaker in either case without unnecessary delay and the undertaker must not commence the construction of the specified works until the engineer has notified the undertaker that the protective works have been completed to their reasonable satisfaction.	
	7	6. (1) Any specified work and any protective works to be constructed by virtue of paragraph 5(4) must, when commenced, be constructed— (a) without unnecessary delay in accordance with the plans approved or deemed to have been approved or settled under paragraph 5; (b) under the supervision (where appropriate and if given) and to the reasonable satisfaction of the engineer; (c) in such manner as to cause as little damage as is possible to railway property; and (d) so far as is reasonably practicable, so as not to interfere with or obstruct the free, uninterrupted and safe use of any railway of Network Rail or the traffic thereon and the use by passengers of railway property. (2) If any damage to railway property or any such interference or obstruction shall be caused by the carrying out of, or in consequence of the construction of a specified work, the undertaker must, notwithstanding any such approval, make good such damage and must pay to Network Rail all reasonable expenses to which Network Rail may be put and compensation for any loss which it may sustain by reason of any such damage, interference or obstruction. (3) Nothing in this Part of this Schedule imposes any liability on the undertaker with respect to any damage, costs, expenses or loss attributable to the negligence of Network Rail or its servants, contractors or agents or any liability on Network Rail with respect of any damage, costs, expenses or loss attributable to the negligence of the undertaker or its servants, contractors or agents.	
	8	7. The undertaker must- (a) at all times afford reasonable facilities to the engineer for access to a specified work during its construction; and (b) supply the engineer with all such information as they may reasonably require with regard to a specified work or the method of constructing it.	
	9	8. Network Rail must at all times afford reasonable facilities to the undertaker and its agents for access to any works carried out by Network Rail under this Part of this Schedule during their construction and must supply the undertaker with such information as it may reasonably require with regard to such works or the method of constructing them.	

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
	10	9. (1) If any permanent or temporary alterations or additions to railway property are reasonably necessary in consequence of the construction or completion of a specified work in order to ensure the safety of railway property or the continued safe operation of the railway of Network Rail, such alterations and additions may be carried out by Network Rail and if Network Rail gives to the undertaker 56 days' notice (or in the event of an emergency or safety critical issue such notice as is reasonable in the circumstances) of its intention to carry out such alterations or additions (which must be specified in the notice), the undertaker must pay to Network Rail the reasonable cost of those alterations or additions including, in respect of any such alterations and additions as are to be permanent, a capitalised sum representing the increase of the costs which may be expected to be reasonably incurred by Network Rail in maintaining, working and, when necessary, renewing any such alterations or additions. (2) If during the construction of a specified work by the undertaker, Network Rail gives notice to the undertaker that Network Rail desires itself to construct that part of the specified work which in the opinion of the engineer is endangering the stability of railway property or the safe operation of traffic on the railways of Network Rail then, if the undertaker decides that part of the specified work is to be constructed, Network Rail must assume construction of that part of the specified work and the undertaker must, notwithstanding any such approval of a specified work under paragraph 5(3), pay to Network Rail all reasonable expenses to which Network Rail may be put and compensation for any loss which it may suffer by reason of the execution by Network Rail of that specified work. (3) The engineer must, in respect of the capitalised sums referred to in this paragraph and paragraph 10(a) provide such details of the formula by which those sums have been calculated as the undertaker may reasonably require. (4) If the cost of maintaining, working or renewing railway property is reduced in consequence of any such alterations or additions a capitalised sum representing such saving must be set off against any sum payable by the undertaker to Network Rail under this paragraph.	
	11	10. The undertaker must repay to Network Rail all reasonable fees, costs, charges and expenses reasonably incurred by Network Rail— (a) in constructing any part of a specified work on behalf of the undertaker as provided by paragraph 5(3) or in constructing any protective works under the provisions of paragraph 5(4) including, in respect of any permanent protective works, a capitalised sum representing the cost of maintaining and renewing those works; (b) in respect of the approval by the engineer of plans submitted by the undertaker and the supervision by the engineer of the construction of a specified work; (c) in respect of the employment or procurement of the services of any inspectors, signallers, watch-persons and other persons whom it shall be reasonably necessary to appoint for inspecting, signalling, watching and lighting railway property and for preventing, so far as may be reasonably practicable, interference, obstruction, danger or accident arising from the construction or failure of a specified work; (d) in respect of any special traffic working resulting from any speed restrictions which may in the opinion of the engineer, require to be imposed by reason or in consequence of the construction or failure of a specified work or from the substitution or diversion of services which may be reasonably necessary for the same reason; and (e) in respect of any additional temporary lighting of railway property in the vicinity of the specified works, being lighting made reasonably necessary by reason or in consequence of the construction or failure of a specified work.	

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
	12	11. (1) In this paragraph- "EMI" means, subject to sub-paragraph (2), electromagnetic interference with Network Rail apparatus generated by the operation of the authorised development where such interference is of a level which adversely affects the safe operation of Network Rail's apparatus; and "Network Rail's apparatus" means any lines, circuits, wires, apparatus or equipment (whether or not modified or installed as part of the authorised development) which are owned or used by Network Rail for the purpose of transmitting or receiving electrical energy or of radio, telegraphic, telephonic, electric, electronic or other like means of signalling or other communications. (2) This paragraph applies to EMI only to the extent that such EMI is not attributable to any change to Network Rail's apparatus carried out after approval of plans under paragraph 5(1) for the relevant part of the authorised development giving rise to EMI (unless the undertaker has been given notice in writing before the approval of those plans of the intention to make such change). (3) Subject to sub-paragraph (5), the undertaker must in the design and construction of the authorised development take all measures necessary to prevent EMI and must establish with Network Rail (both parties acting reasonably) appropriate arrangements to verify their effectiveness. (4) In order to facilitate the undertaker's compliance with sub-paragraph (3)- (a) the undertaker must consult with Network Rail as early as reasonably practicable to identify all Network Rail's apparatus which may be at risk of EMI, and thereafter must continue to consult with Network Rail (both before and after formal submission of plans under paragraph 5(1)) in order to identify all potential causes of EMI and the measures required to eliminate them; (b) Network Rail must make available to the undertaker all information in the possession of Network Rail reasonably requested by the undertaker in respect of Network Rail's apparatus identified pursuant to sub-paragraph (a); and (c) Network Rail must allow the undertaker reasonable facilities for the inspection of Network Rail's apparatus identified pursuant to sub-paragraph (a). (5) In any case where it is established that EMI can only reasonably be prevented by modifications to Network Rail's apparatus, Network Rail must not withhold its consent unreasonably to modifications of Network Rail's apparatus, but the means of prevention and the method of their execution must be selected in the reasonable discretion of Network Rail, and in relation to such modifications paragraph 5(1) has effect subject to the sub-paragraph. (6) Prior to the commencement of operation of the authorised development the undertaker shall test the use of the authorised development in a manner that shall first have been agreed with Network Rail and if, notwithstanding any measures adopted pursuant to sub-paragraph (3), the testing of the authorised development causes EMI then the undertaker must immediately upon receipt of notification by Network Rail of such EMI either in writing or communicated orally (such oral communication to be confirmed in writing as soon as reasonably practicable after it has been issued) forthwith cease to use (or procure the cessation of use of) the undertaker's apparatus causing such EMI until all measures necessary have been taken to remedy such EMI by way of modification to the source of such EMI or (in the circumstances, and subject to the consent, specified in sub-paragraph (5)) to Network Rail's apparatus. (7) In the event of EMI having occurred – (a) the undertaker must afford reasonable facilities to Network Rail for access to the undertaker's apparatus in the investigation of such EMI; (b) Network Rail must afford reasonable facilities to the undertaker for access to Network Rail's	Section 14.8 of Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the Environmental Statement **[APP-039]** provides an assessment of the potential impacts associated with electro-magnetic fields (EMF). Solar panel arrays emit EMF in the same extremely low frequency ranges as electrical appliances and wiring found in most houses and buildings. The Proposed Development would be fully compliant with relevant Government policy and all the EMFs produced would be below the relevant exposure limits and therefore no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development. Underground cables eliminate the electric field altogether as it is screened out by the sheath around the cable, but they still produce magnetic fields. The National Grid document 'Undergrounding high voltage electricity transmission lines'[3] states that for a 400kV cable buried at 0.9 m depth, the typical magnetic field is 24 microteslas when on top of the cable and 3 microteslas at 5m from the centreline, with the maximum level known by National Grid being 96 microteslas on top of the cable at 0.9 m depth, and 13 microteslas at 5m. Taking into account this guidance and the UK limits set for safety of members of the public, the maximum reported electromagnetic field for High Voltage (HV) cables buried at 0.9m depth would comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) limits[4] and were therefore scoped out of the assessment. The Department of Energy and Climate Change's (DECC) guidance 'Power Lines: Demonstrating Compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines. A voluntary Code of Practice'[5] states that underground cables at voltages up to and including 132kV are considered not capable of exceeding the ICNIRP exposure guidelines for electromagnetic fields and that compliance with exposure guidelines for such equipment can be assumed unless evidence is brought to the contrary in specific cases. However, there is potential for exceedances of 132kV where infrastructure overlaps. The Interconnecting Cables between Solar PV areas are not considered in the assessment as they would have a very low voltage of less than 1kV and therefore would not significantly contribute to any increase in electromagnetic fields should they overlap with other infrastructure. Appendix 14-F: Electromagnetic Fields Assessment of the Environmental Statement **[APP-175]** provides further detail on the potential for EMF effects as a result of the Proposed Development.

[3] National Grid (2015) Undergrounding high voltage electricity transmission lines
[4] International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (2020) ICNIRP Guideline for Limiting Exposure to Electromagnetic Fiels (100kHz to 300 GHz)
[5] Department of Energy & Climate Change (2012) Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines. A voluntary Code of Practice

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
		apparatus in the investigation of such EMI; (c) Network Rail must make available to the undertaker any additional material information in its possession reasonably requested by the undertaker in respect of Network Rail's apparatus or such EMI; and (d) the undertaker shall not allow the use or operation of the authorised development in a manner that has caused or will cause EMI until measures have been taken in accordance with this paragraph to prevent EMI occurring. (8) Where Network Rail approves modifications to Network Rail's apparatus pursuant to sub-paragraphs (5) or (6) – (a) Network Rail must allow the undertaker reasonable facilities for the inspection of the relevant part of Network Rail's apparatus; (b) any modifications to Network Rail's apparatus approved pursuant to those sub-paragraphs must be carried out and completed by the undertaker in accordance with paragraph 6. (9) To the extent that it would not otherwise do so, the indemnity in paragraph 15(1) applies to the costs and expenses reasonably incurred or losses suffered by Network Rail through the implementation of the provisions of this paragraph (including costs incurred in connection with the consideration of proposals, approval of plans, supervision and inspection of works and facilitating access to Network Rail's apparatus) or in consequence of any EMI to which sub-paragraph (6) applies. (10) For the purpose of paragraph 10(a) any modifications to Network Rail's apparatus under this paragraph shall be deemed to be protective works referred to in that paragraph. (11) In relation to any dispute arising under this paragraph the reference in article 43 (Arbitration) to the Institution of Civil Engineers shall be read as a reference to the Institution of Engineering and Technology.	
	13	12. If at any time after the completion of a specified work, not being a work vested in Network Rail, Network Rail gives notice to the undertaker informing it that the state of maintenance of any part of the specified work appears to be such as adversely affects the operation of railway property, the undertaker must, on receipt of such notice, take such steps as may be reasonably necessary to put that specified work in such state of maintenance as not adversely to affect railway property.	The Applicant has reviewed the form of PPs provided by Network Rail and has provided comments directly to their solicitors as to the appropriateness of these.
	14	13. The undertaker must not provide any illumination or illuminated sign or signal on or in connection with a specified work in the vicinity of any railway belonging to Network Rail unless it has first consulted Network Rail and it must comply with Network Rail's reasonable requirements for preventing confusion between such illumination or illuminated sign or signal and any railway signal or other light used for controlling, directing or securing the safety of traffic on the railway.	Given the closest Network Rail assets are the Newark to Lincoln line, passing through Collingham, Swinderby and Hykeham, approximately 800m to the north of the Order Limits, this is not considered to be a potential issue.
	15	14. Any additional expenses which Network Rail may reasonably incur in altering, reconstructing or maintaining railway property under any powers existing at the making of this Order by reason of the existence of a specified work must, provided that 56 days' previous notice of the commencement of such alteration, reconstruction or maintenance has been given to the undertaker, be repaid by the undertaker to Network Rail.	The Applicant has reviewed the form of PPs provided by Network Rail and has provided comments directly to their solicitors as to the appropriateness of these.
	16	15. (1) The undertaker must pay to Network Rail all reasonable costs, charges, damages and expenses not otherwise provided for in this Part of this Schedule (subject to article 42 (no double recovery)) which may be occasioned to or reasonably incurred by Network Rail— (a) by reason of the construction, maintenance or operation of a specified work or the failure thereof; or	

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
		(b) by reason of any act or omission of the undertaker or of any person in its employ or of its contractors or others whilst engaged upon a specified work; (c) by reason of any act or omission of the undertaker or any person in its employ or of its contractors or others whilst accessing to or egressing from the authorised development; (d) in respect of any damage caused to or additional maintenance required to, railway property or any such interference or obstruction or delay to the operation of the railway as a result of access to or egress from the authorised development by the undertaker or any person in its employ or of its contractors or others; (e) in respect of costs incurred by Network Rail in complying with any railway operational procedures or obtaining any regulatory consents which procedures are required to be followed or consents obtained to facilitate the carrying out or operation of the authorised development; and the undertaker must indemnify and keep indemnified Network Rail from and against all claims and demands arising out of or in connection with a specified work or any such failure, act or omission: and the fact that any act or thing may have been done by Network Rail on behalf of the undertaker or in accordance with plans approved by the engineer or in accordance with any requirement of the engineer or under the engineer's supervision shall not (if it was done without negligence on the part of Network Rail or of any person in its employ or of its contractors or agents) excuse the undertaker from any liability under the provisions of this sub-paragraph. (2) Network Rail must – (a) give the undertaker reasonable written notice of any such claims or demands (b) not make any settlement or compromise of such a claim or demand without the prior consent of the undertaker; and (c) take such steps as are within its control and are reasonable in the circumstances to mitigate any liabilities relating to such claims or demands. (3) The sums payable by the undertaker under sub-paragraph (1) shall if relevant include a sum equivalent to the relevant costs. (4) Subject to the terms of any agreement between Network Rail and a train operator regarding the timing or method of payment of the relevant costs in respect of that train operator, Network Rail must promptly pay to each train operator the amount of any sums which Network Rail receives under sub-paragraph (3) which relates to the relevant costs of that train operator. (5) The obligation under sub-paragraph (3) to pay Network Rail the relevant costs shall, in the event of default, be enforceable directly by any train operator concerned to the extent that such sums would be payable to that operator pursuant to sub paragraph (4). (6) In this paragraph— "the relevant costs" means the costs, losses and expenses (including loss of revenue) reasonably incurred by each train operator as a consequence of any specified work including but not limited to any restriction of the use of Network Rail's railway network as a result of the construction, maintenance or failure of a specified work or any such act or omission as mentioned in subparagraph (1); and "train operator" means any person who is authorised to act as the operator of a train by a licence under section 8 of the Railways Act 1993.	
	17	16. Network Rail must, on receipt of a request from the undertaker, from time to time provide the undertaker free of charge with written estimates of the costs, charges, expenses and other liabilities for which the undertaker is or will become liable under this Part of this Schedule (including the amount of the relevant costs mentioned in paragraph 15) and with such information as may reasonably enable the undertaker to assess the reasonableness of	

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representations	Response to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation
		any such estimate or claim made or to be made pursuant to this Part of this Schedule (including any claim relating to those relevant costs).	
	18	17. In the assessment of any sums payable to Network Rail under this Part of this Schedule there must not be taken into account any increase in the sums claimed that is attributable to any action taken by or any agreement entered into by Network Rail if that action or agreement was not reasonably necessary and was taken or entered into with a view to obtaining the payment of those sums by the undertaker under this Part of this Schedule or increasing the sums so payable.	
	19	18. The undertaker and Network Rail may, subject in the case of Network Rail to compliance with the terms of its network licence, enter into, and carry into effect, agreements for the transfer to the undertaker of— (a) any railway property shown on the works and land plans and described in the book of reference; (b) any lands, works or other property held in connection with any such railway property; and (c) any rights and obligations (whether or not statutory) of Network Rail relating to any railway property or any lands, works or other property referred to in this paragraph.	
	20	19. Nothing in this Order, or in any enactment incorporated with or applied by this Order, prejudices or affects the operation of Part I of the Railways Act 1993.	
	21	20. The undertaker must give written notice to Network Rail if any application is proposed to be made by the undertaker for the Secretary of State's consent, under article 35 (consent to transfer of benefit of the Order) of this Order and any such notice must be given no later than 28 days before any such application is made and must describe or give (as appropriate)— (a) the nature of the application to be made; (b) the extent of the geographical area to which the application relates; and (c) the name and address of the person acting for the Secretary of State to whom the application is to be made. 21 The undertaker must no later than 28 days from the date that the plans submitted to and certified by the Secretary of State in accordance with article 41 (certification of plans and documents etc.) are certified by the Secretary of State, provide a set of those plans to Network Rail in a format specified by Network Rail. 22 In relation to any dispute arising under this part of this Part of this Schedule (except for those disputes referred to in paragraph 11(11)) the provisions of article 43 (Arbitration) shall not apply and any such dispute, unless otherwise provided for, must be referred to and settled by a single arbitrator to be agreed between the parties or, failing agreement, to be appointed on the application of either party (after giving notice in writing to the other) to the President of the Institution of Civil Engineers.	

2.3 Natural England

Table 2-3: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Natural England

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
RR-202	1	**Internationally Designated Sites: NE1 Study Area** The Habitats Regulations Assessment (APP-181), paragraph 2.2.2 sets out the study areas used to identify relevant internationally designated sites: - 10km for all sites - 20km for sites supporting birds - 30km for sites supporting bats. It is also welcomed that a search beyond these distances has been undertaken to determine hydrological connections. NE consider the study areas used to be appropriate.	The Applicant notes this comment.
	2	**Internationally Designated Sites: NE2 Identification of Sites** No relevant sites are located within the 10km, 20km or 30km study areas, with the nearest site being Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, approximately 24km to the west of the Order Limits. It has been identified that the River Witham & other watercourses are connected to. The Wash SPA and Ramsar and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, however, resulting from the distance to the Order Limits (70km), no impact pathways have been identified. Despite the hydrological connection, due to the nature of the project, distance downstream, and embedded mitigation (which includes buffer strips from all watercourses, use of HDD for key watercourse crossings, and pollution prevention measures (as detailed in fCEMP Table 4 (APP189)) NE concur with the conclusion of the HRA and consider that no appreciable effects on the Wash designations are likely. The relevant embedded mitigation measures are secured appropriately via Requirement 12 - CEMP (APP-016).	The Applicant notes this comment.
	3	**Internationally Designated Sites: NE3 In-combination Assessment** It is noted that the project will not have any appreciable effects upon the qualifying features of any Internationally designated sites; thus, the project cannot combine with any other plans/projects to cause a significant effect. Upon review of the assessment provided, NE concur that no in combination effects are likely.	The Applicant notes this comment.
	4	**Nationally Designated Sites: NE4 Study Area and Identification of Sites** Chapter 12 (APP-033), paragraph 8.5.4 sets out the study area used to identify relevant nationally designated sites: - 5km or: - 200m from the Affected Road Network NE consider the study areas used to be appropriate and note that no relevant sites have been identified.	The Applicant notes this comment.
	5	**Nationally Designated Sites: NE5 Swanholme Lakes SSSI** NE welcome the review of impact pathways between the proposed development and Swanholme Lakes SSSI in response to preapplication advice from NE and the Planning	The Applicant notes this comment.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
		Inspectorate. NE concur that no hydrological links exist and that no further assessment is required.	
	6	**Designated Landscapes: NE6** The proposed development is not located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscapes. As a result, NE has no specific comments to make on landscape implications of this development.	The Applicant notes this comment.
	7	**Protected Species Licencing: NE7** NE have not reviewed protected species survey approaches & results in detail to inform these representations and refer to our protected species standing advice here. Nonetheless, NE welcome the approach to avoid impacts upon protected species via avoidance by design, which is in line with the established 'mitigation hierarchy'. Ultimately it is the responsibility of the developer to determine the need for any protected species licences. Chapter 8, Table 8-2 (APP-033) states: 'With embedded mitigation and avoidance, as presented in Table 8-13, there is no requirement for protected species licences as protected species, such as Badger, will be avoided. However, where this may change (e.g. during pre-commencement checks) and if such features cannot be avoided, then NE will be consulted at the earliest opportunity'. As a result, no licence need has been identified, and Natural England have not issued any Letters of No Impediment for protected species. As stated, where further survey reveals the need for any protected species licences from Natural England, further consultation will be required, and these will need to be applied for in the usual manner. Natural England are unable to provide a position on the likelihood of a licence being granted without having reviewed a draft licence application.	As set out in Table 8-2 of ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation **[APP-033]** the Applicant does not anticipate that any protected species licences will be required, due to the avoidance and mitigation measures embedded in the Proposed Development design. However, should pre-commencement surveys indicate a change in baseline ecological conditions, which may require protected species licences then Natural England will be consulted and appropriate licences submitted as relevant. The requirement for pre-construction surveys is set out in within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, (ref. ECO-C5, ECO-C6, ECO-C7, ECO-C8 and ECO-C9) a detailed version of which, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, is secured via Schedule 2, Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. For example, in relation to bats, ECO-C7 notes *"Pre-construction (ground-level inspection) surveys will be undertaken to support the baseline survey findings, the purpose of which is to ensure mitigation during the construction phase is based on the latest protected species information and Proposed Development design. Should there have been any changes to the design which could impact upon roosting bats (i.e. additional tree removal of trees with potential to support roosting bats), where found within the DCO Site, then further surveys will be undertaken as required (e.g. bat emergence surveys), then Natural England licences will be sought (if required) and mitigation measures updated accordingly."*
	8	**Soils and BMV Land: NE8 Development Design and Avoidance of BMV Land** Design Principle 2 of the Planning Statement (APP185) sets out the design principle of avoidance of BMV land wherever possible. The Planning Statement (APP-185) Appendix A 'Site Selection Report' (and it's appendices in particular) set out clearly how the avoidance of Best and Most Versatile Land has been considered through the design process in line with relevant national policy. Whilst BMV land could not be avoided altogether, it is noted that the site selection process began via excluding all provisionally mapped BMV land, and worked back from there, identifying a suitable site only affecting provisionally mapped Grade 3 land (Planning Statement (APP-185) paragraph 6.3.154).	The Applicant notes this comment.
	9	**Soils and BMV Land: NE9 ALC Survey Methodology** NE note that a full detailed ALC survey has been undertaken on the Principle Site, in line with the relevant MAFF 1988 guidelines (APP-161). This is welcomed. However, no ALC survey has been undertaken along the cable route to date.	The Applicant acknowledges Natural England's advice regarding a pre-consent ALC survey of the full Order Limits, however, considers that the current proposed approach is appropriate and robust. The area within the Principal Site that was inaccessible for survey is illustrated on Figure 12-5 Agricultural Land Classification for the Principal Site **[AS-068]**. There is a field near Thurlby,

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
		Chapter 12, paragraph 12.4.16 notes that an ALC survey of the Cable Route will be undertaken pre-construction, to inform soil handling and reinstatement. This has been secured within the fCEMP (Table 7, ID SOC-C3). This is also secured in the framework Soil Management Plan (fSMP), paragraph 7.2.2 (APP-192). It is also noted that some areas of the principal site were not surveyed due to varying constraints. NE welcome that these areas will also be surveyed pre-construction, as secured in the fSMP paragraph 7.2.2 (APP-192). It is Natural England's advice that an ALC survey of the full order limits should be undertaken pre-consent, to inform site wide design to avoid BMV land as far as practicable and inform the Soil Management Plan. Nonetheless, it is noted that: • A pre-construction detailed ALC survey has been secured within the fCEMP (Table 7, ID SOC-C3), which will be used to inform the SMP and restoration to the same ALC grade. • There are additional constraints around the cable route siting due to the NatPower Brant BESS scheme and shared cable route (12.4.16) • When applying IEMA's significance criteria, presence or absence of BMV land in the cable corridor would not constitute a significant effect in EIA terms (Table 12-2 page 20) As such, in this case, this matter is considered not agreed, but unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. The pre-construction ALC survey of the cable route is secured within the DCO by DCO (APP-016) Requirement 12 – Construction Environment Management Plan. The Restoration of the Cable route of the same ALC grade following construction, and the is secured within the DCO via Requirement 15 – Soil Management Plan.	which based on the soil data for the surrounding fields, is likely to be Grade 3a or 3b land. The area not surveyed may be temporarily disturbed during the installation of buried cables (if needed in this field), after which it is allocated during operation as 'retained arable/grassland'. It therefore may continue to be used for arable farming, should – as expected - the landowner choose, but includes the flexibility to be managed as good quality grassland in the event this is preferred by the Applicant or landowner (as they can choose to do currently). The lack of data in this field is therefore not considered to be a gap that would affect the conclusions of the assessment (i.e., there is no magnitude of change / impact after any cabling is installed, and the soil is reinstated). There is also some land east of the Onsite Substation, which forms part of the Bird Mitigation land (either grassland or arable managed), which was not surveyed and based on the surrounding fields may be Grade 3a. Given this soil would be managed to avoid damage and will be available for arable farming after installation, the baseline data for this field will also not change the conclusions of the ES (i.e., there is no magnitude of change / impact). Paragraph 7.2.2 of the Framework Soil Management Plan (SMP) **[AS-100]** states that the areas without data will be surveyed prior to construction to inform the SMP, i.e., that there will be "soil surveys across remaining areas of the site red line boundary: including the cable corridor, previously inaccessible areas and compound locations etc. Sample density must be in accordance with relevant ALC guidance, i.e. one sample per 100m of linear route or 1 per hectare of site area and undertaken by suitably qualified soil surveys in accordance with the BSSS guidance". As Natural England acknowledge, the soil survey of a defined cable route is proposed post-consent (along with restoration to pre-construction condition of the soil resource) and is secured by the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** (which is to be developed into a detailed SMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, secured under Requirement 15 (soil management plan) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). This is considered appropriate as a survey of the Cable Corridor would not provide additional information to avoid Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land due to the proposed NatPower Brant BESS scheme (a cumulative scheme discussed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**). As this scheme will have a shared cable corridor with the Proposed Development, flexibility is needed at this stage to ensure both these projects are deliverable. It is also necessary to avoid other buried infrastructure and above ground constraints. Whether the corridor would be in BMV or non-BMV land, it would be restored after installation to the same grade through the measures and controls contained within the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** and therefore does not affect the conclusions of the ES. The cable will require excavation of a trench approximately 2m by 2m (with at least 0.9m soil on the top of the cable, which is below the depth of agricultural cultivation), and the disruption to agricultural land would be temporary and reversible, with no permanent loss of farmland. Furthermore, sampling of the Cable Corridor at a sampling density of 1 sample per 100m at this stage may miss sampling the land that would be trenched/impacted, due to the small size of the trench relative to the corridor. This would be counter-productive for soil handling measures as the detailed SMP would be based on soil conditions that might not be applicable for the proposed trench. This is another reason why it is preferable to carry out the sampling post consent, once the trench and working area locations are known.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
			When applying IEMA's significance criteria[6], presence or absence of BMV land in the cable corridor would not constitute a significant effect in EIA terms, and as such the effects established within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** would remain unchanged even if knowing more accurately the baseline conditions. The grade of ALC does not affect the conclusions of the assessment, due to the land remaining farmed and with the same ALC grade after construction. This approach aligns with other recent consented solar NSIPs. It is the Applicant's understanding that the above principals were agreed recently by the Examination and Secretary of State on Tillbridge Solar and Helios Solar, neither of which carried out soil sampling at DCO Application stage to inform the ES. As per NE15 below, the Applicant agrees to include Natural England as a consultee within sub-paragraph (1) of Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 – the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. As such, Natural England will have the opportunity to review the detailed SMP prior to any approval.
	10	**Soils and BMV Land: NE10 Assessment Methodology** Natural England generally welcome the assessment methodology. Table 12-9 (APP-037) sets out the magnitude criteria for impacts to BMV land in line with IEMA's guidance ('A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment'), indicating that a permanent loss of >20ha of BMV land would constitute a Major Magnitude effect. This is welcomed. However, Table 12-10 sets out the Sensitivity Criteria for Agricultural Land, indicating that agricultural land of ALC grades 1 & 2 is of High sensitivity, whilst Grade 3a is of medium sensitivity. This is not in line with IEMA's guidance, having downgraded the sensitivity of BMV land. Natural England advise that the Assessment should be amended with the sensitivity of each ALC grade assessed as: • ALC Grade 1 & 2 land: Very High • ALC Grade 3a land: High • ALC Grade 3b land: Medium • ALC Grade 4 & 5 land: Low These criteria are in line with IEMA's 'A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment' and the ICE (2019) EIA handbook.	The Applicant acknowledges that the terminology used in the assessment presented in the ES chapter differs to the terminology set out in IEMA's 'A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment'[6]. However, the IEMA Guidelines (page 51) notes: "*Furthermore, when using the above matrices within an ES, the terminology of the tables may need to be adapted to align with a wider EIA reporting terminology framework used within a specific ES.*" The Applicant sought to adapt the significance criteria to better align with the structure presented in Chapter 5: EIA Methodology **[APP-030]**. Nevertheless, applying the IEMA guidance stringently, as requested by NE, it is not considered to change the ES conclusions. There are three elements to the Proposed Development: land affected temporarily during construction and reinstated; land used in operation and then returned to farming after decommissioning, and land that is permanently lost from farming. The latter is considered most critical. There is 4.6ha of land that is classed as permanently lost, due to the proposed landscaping that the Applicant does not intend to remove during decommissioning. Of this 1.5ha is Grade 3a, BMV. The area of loss is less than 5ha and therefore minor magnitude of impact, for either a High (on BMV land) or Medium (on non-BMV land) sensitivity; this results in a Slight effect on the non-BMV land, and Slight or Moderate on the BMV land. Given the area of BMV lost is over 3 times less than the 5ha threshold, it is appropriate to conclude a Slight effect, which in the ES would correspond with a minor adverse effect that is not significant. Furthermore, this land is not truly lost from farming forever; the landowners/farmers can choose to remove the landscaping/planting in the future if they choose (and part of this is the community orchard, which technically is a form of agricultural use). For the land affected temporarily during construction and reinstated, the impact would be a few weeks – or months at worst – affecting one growing season. The land will be reinstated to its current condition and will be available for farming immediately after restoration. This is

[6] Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (2022) A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
			considered to be no discernible loss or reduction of soil functions or soil volumes that restrict the current farming activity; a Negligible magnitude of change using the IEMA criteria. This corresponds with a Slight effect, which in the ES would correspond with a minor adverse effect that is not significant. Finally, the land under the solar panels constitutes a mix of Grade 3a (High sensitivity) and 3b (Medium sensitivity) land. The soil is still present (it is not displaced) and following implementation of good soil handling and construction methods the soil should maintain the same ALC or recover to this status. It would also still be available for sheep grazing under panels which itself is still a form of agricultural land use, although not arable. There is no discernible loss or reduction of soil functions or soil volumes that restrict the current farming activity. It is acknowledged that a farmer would not attempt to grow wheat or many other crops due to the obstacle that the solar infrastructure presents, however the soil would allow this if the panels were removed. Rather than attribute a Moderate, significant adverse effect to the change of land use followed by a moderate, significant beneficial effect when the panels are removed and facilitate arable farming again, it is considered appropriate to assign a Negligible magnitude of change to this impact, which results in a Slight effect. This corresponds with a minor adverse effect using the ES terminology, that is not significant. As such, it is considered that the conclusions within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** remain unchanged, and the effects with regards to the permanent loss of the 1.5ha of BMV as a result of ecological enhancements associated with the Proposed Development, and the long term, reversible change of use of 282.9ha of BMV (relating to the Solar PV Array elements of the Proposed Development) is considered a 'minor' adverse effect. It is therefore not considered necessary to update the ES to change the criteria for sensitivity in this instance and it would have no bearing on the outcome of the assessment.
	11	**Soils and BMV Land: NE11 ALC Survey Results – ALC Grade Boundaries** Figure 12-5 (APP-106), illustrates the ALC grades mapped across the principal site. Natural England note that the ALC boundaries appear to be drawn in strict straight lines, conforming to field boundaries and grid points. Land should be graded and mapped without regard to present field boundaries, except where they coincide with permanent physical features. Usually, it is expected that ALC boundaries would be calculated using an inverse distance weighted modelling tool. NE query the methodology used to draw ALC grade boundaries in Figure 12-5.	Whilst the Applicant notes that curved boundaries are sometimes preferred in land grading mapping to reflect natural variation, in this case, the delineation between Grades 3a and 3b has been represented using straight lines for clarity and consistency of presentation. Some of the mapped boundaries also correspond to permanent features such as roads, farm lanes, and existing field divisions, which are inherently linear and therefore appropriately represented as straight lines. The sample points informing the grading were computer-generated on a regular 1 ha (2.47 acres) grid, providing an even spatial distribution across the site. The grade boundaries were subsequently delineated manually based on the results from these evenly spaced samples. The mapping technique utilised uses "linear interpolation", which connects two sample points with a straight line, assuming a constant rate of change between them. It is possible to use spline interpolation or spline smoothing, which fits a smooth curve through the points by using statistical algorithms to estimate values at unsampled locations between auger points. Each technique has its own advantages and disadvantages. The linear interpolation does not attempt to estimate values between auger points and presents a factual representation of the accuracy of the data. The smoothing techniques can appear more accurate to the eye but are based on estimates that give an unknown level of accuracy and imply a false level of accuracy associated with the results. It is not considered a weakness selecting the linear interpolation technique.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
			As such, the straight-line representation is an interpretive visualisation of the data rather than a reflection of exact field variation. Given the uniform sampling density, curving the boundaries would not alter the distribution or total area of Grades 3a and 3b within the site, the change would be purely cosmetic. Therefore, the use of straight versus curved boundaries has no effect on the conclusions of the assessment within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, as the classification is determined by the underlying dataset rather than the graphical representation of the boundary.
	12	**Soils and BMV Land: NE12 ALC Survey Results – BMV Area Discrepancy** The ALC Survey Report (APP-161) states 241ha of BMV land was identified within the surveyed areas, yet in the ES, Table 12-5 (APP-037) indicates that 282.9ha are BMV. NE have been unable to identify any reasoning within the ES or survey report for this difference. It is noted that the Order Limits cover a smaller area than the ALC survey report, due to changes in the site boundary during the design process, but this should not cause this change in BMV area identified. NE request clarity on the Area of the DCO site classified as BMV land.	The Applicant acknowledges that there is a discrepancy in the area of BMV land reported within Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report **[APP-161]** and Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. As detailed within the Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report **[APP-161]** disclaimer found on page 3, this Report was produced in October 2024 based on a previous version of the Site boundary, and therefore figures may illustrate a Site boundary that differs to the Order Limits for which consent is being sought. The area of BMV land reported (and subsequently assessed) in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (i.e. 282.9ha (699 acres)) is correct, and as such this does not affect the findings and conclusions of the Report or the Environmental Statement chapters that rely on it.
	13	**Soils and BMV Land: NE13 ALC Survey Results – Assessment of Impacts** The ES sets out that of the Overall site areas of 1018.7ha, 282.9ha of BMV land will be temporarily used for the proposed development. This has been assessed to be a minor adverse effect and not significant. Of the 282.9ha, only 1.5ha of BMV land will be permanently lost as a result of ecological enhancements associated with the proposed development. This has been assessed as a minor adverse effect, which is not significant. As per issue ref NE10, NE consider that all BMV land should be classified as high sensitivity. As a result, this low magnitude impact to a high sensitivity receptor would result in a Moderate, significant impact, as set out in Table 12-14 and paragraph 12.4.49 (APP-037). NE welcome the consideration of the impact of ecological enhancements on BMV land. Often, despite leading to a reduction in available agricultural land, ecological enhancements can retain the soil resource and protect its long-term capabilities. It is where enhancements require intrusive groundworks, or include deep rooting species (i.e. woodland), that they can lead to a permanent loss of BMV resource. The assessment of the permanent loss of BMV land should be revisited with regard to NE10. NE also query the ecological enhancements that have been considered to cause this permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the proposed development.	See response to NE10. With regards to the assessed permanent loss of 1.5ha of BMV as a result of ecological enhancements associated with the Proposed Development, paragraph 12.7.44 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** assesses this as a minor adverse and not significant effect. It is noted that the terminology used in the assessment presented in the ES chapter differs to the terminology set out in IEMA's 'A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment'[6], however the IEMA Guidelines (page 51) note: "*Furthermore, when using the above matrices within an ES, the terminology of the tables may need to be adapted to align with a wider EIA reporting terminology framework used within a specific ES.*" The magnitude of impact associated with the 1.5ha of BMV permanent loss is under the 5ha threshold, and as such is classified as 'Low' in line with Table 12-9 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, or 'Minor' in line with Table 3 within the IEMA Guidelines. When applying a 'High' level of sensitivity (in line with Table 2 within the IEMA Guidelines), the resultant effect (in line with matrix set out in Table 5 of the IEMA Guidelines) is noted as 'Slight or Moderate'. It is considered that a 'Slight' (or 'minor' as established within the ES chapter) is an appropriate conclusion of effect in this instance as opposed to 'Moderate', given that the 1.5ha is well below (more than 3 times below) the 5ha threshold. The IEMA Guidelines (page 51) state: *"many situations may not neatly fall within the definitions provided in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5, and in all cases these tables should not replace professional judgement by experienced professionals based on the specifics and context of the EIA being undertaken."*). As explained in paragraph 12.7.44 of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the change of land use is likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production. As such, it is considered that the conclusion within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** remains correct, and the effect with regards to the permanent loss of 1.5ha

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
			of BMV as a result of ecological enhancements associated with the Proposed Development is a 'minor' adverse effect (which would be 'Slight' if using the IEMA Guidelines terminology).
	14	**Soils and BMV Land: NE14 Time Limit** NE note the inclusion of a 60-year time limit for the proposed development, secured via Requirement 20.	The Applicant notes this comment – responses are provided in relation to NE16 and NE17 below.
	15	**Soils and BMV Land: NE15 Soil Management Plan** NE welcome the commitment to produce a detailed SMP pre-construction. NE have reviewed the fSMP provided (APP-192), and generally welcome the principles set out. Some further comment on the fSMP is made at NE16 & NE17. An amendment to DCO Requirement 15 is requested to ensure NE are consulted on the detailed soil management plan. DCO (APP-016) requirement 15 secures the Soil Management Plan.	The Applicant agrees to include Natural England as a consultee within sub-paragraph (1) of Requirement 15 of Schedule 2. The Draft DCO **[APP-016]** has been updated accordingly and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.
	16	**Soils and BMV Land: NE16 Soil Management Plan – Soil Handling** fSMP paragraph 5.3.3 notes that details of on-site soil moisture assessment techniques will be outlined in the SMP (APP-192). NE recommend the use of the Institute of Quarrying's 'Guide to Soil Handling in Mineral Workings' Supplementary Note 4, in this regard. NE advise that all soils should only be handled in a dry and friable condition, and it is expected that construction programmes would restrict soil handling to the drier summer period to minimise risk of soil damage (April through September) as far as reasonably practicable. Where avoidance of the wetter winter period is not possible, increased supervision by a suitably trained person is necessary, the construction period is likely to need to be generous to allow for stoppage, and further actions must be included in the Soil management Plan to minimise soil damage, in line with DEFRA's Construction code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites. The detailed SMP should include consideration of the avoidance of soil handing in the wetter winter months. It should also set out clear stop-conditions for wet weather working.	The use of the Institute of Quarrying's 'Guide to Soil Handling in Mineral Workings' Supplementary Note 4 within the detailed SMP is noted; the Framework SMP broadly aligns with this guidance and the detailed SMP will build on this with more detail post consent. As noted above, Requirement 15(1) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** has been updated to include Natural England as a named consultee, and as such Natural England will have the opportunity to review the detailed SMP prior to any approval. The Framework SMP **[AS-100]** acknowledges (ref. paragraph 5.3.2): "*Soil may be irreparably damaged if handled when too wet*", and notes (ref. paragraph 6.8.2): "*All soil resources to be reinstated must be handled only when dry or slightly moist*." The Framework SMP **[AS-100]** also references (ref. paragraph 5.7.1) that: "*Soils should be handled in accordance with the methods as outlined in the DEFRA document*"[7]. The Framework SMP **[AS-100]** requires (ref. paragraph 5.2.1) that *"A site representative shall be appointed to be the person responsible for the management of on-site practices to ensure the implementation of the SMP and any associated SWMP or MMP. This person shall be a suitably qualified and experienced soil scientist or practitioner."* The Framework SMP **[AS-100]** also requires (ref. paragraphs 5.4.1 and 5.5.1) that the stripping of subsoil and topsoil must only occur in the right weather conditions, not in adverse weather conditions, such as sustained heavy rainfall (>10mm in 24 hours). The detailed SMP will be prepared substantially in accordance with the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**, as secured via Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, and as such will include these considerations regarding the handling of soils and appropriate supervision.
	17	**Soils and BMV Land: NE17 Soil Management Plan – Soil Disposal**	The Framework SMP **[AS-100]** allows for the retention and storage of excavated soil onsite.

[7] Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (2011) The Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites -

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
		fSMP Section 6 discusses possible recycling and disposal of soils. NE query the need for any soil disposal, as soils should be stored in appropriate bunds for later reinstatement on-site.	Storage of soils onsite is the preferred approach by the Applicant; there is no obvious reason why any soil extracted onsite would need to be removed from the site. This soil would be stored appropriately so that it is available for reinstatement at a later stage in the Proposed Development, where relevant. The Applicant will provide more clarity and detail on the proposed soil management measures in the detailed SMP, which, under Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** must be substantially in accordance with the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**. For clarity regarding the storage of soils, the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** has been updated in respect of this point and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 5.7.1 of the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** now includes: "*Soils stored for later reinstatement on-site will be stored in appropriate bunds*". As per NE15 above, the Applicant agrees to include Natural England as a consultee within Requirement 15(1) of Schedule 2 – the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. As such, Natural England will have the opportunity to review the detailed SMP prior to any approval.
	18	**Soils and BMV Land: NE18 Soil Reinstatement** Natural England welcome the commitment to restoration of the cable route to its original ALC grade. We also welcome the intent that the ALC grade of the principal site will be unaltered through operation and decommissioning, as secured by the fCEMP (Table 7, ID SOC-C3). However, no breakdown has been provided with regards to the areas to be temporarily disturbed during construction (e.g. cable route, construction access tracks, construction compounds) and for the lifetime of the project (BESS, substation, operational access tracks). The reinstatement of these areas, either post-construction, or during decommissioning, will be necessary to ensure the ALC grade is retained. It would be beneficial to present the land take (and amount of BMV) for each part of the development, including temporary construction losses, temporary operational losses, and permanent losses. As a minimum, the detailed SMP should set out in full the methods for reinstatement of each element of the development, to ensure the soil resource is managed effectively and the BMV resource is retained across order limits. Reinstatement of the cable route and principal site to the same ALC grade is secured within the DCO by DCO (APP-016) Requirement 12 – Construction Environment Management Plan. DCO (APP-016) requirement 15 secures the Soil Management Plan.	With regards to the land take (and amount of BMV) for each element of the Proposed Development, please see the table below. Please note that this calculation has been based on overlaying the illustrative Proposed Development layout figure within the ES (Figure 3-2A **[AS-022]**) with the ALC classification figure within the ES (Figure 12-5 **[AS-068]**), and as such the total ALC areas may not exactly tally to the totals stated in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. Please also note that the calculation in the table below does not account for all planting/habitat creation (e.g. new hedgerow), hence the discrepancy between the total area of BMV to be permanently lost in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (i.e. 1.5ha), and that reported in the table below. Temporary losses are shaded light grey and permanent losses shaded darker grey. ALC Area (ha) Grade 1 / Grade 2 / Grade 3a / Grade 3b / Grade 4 Access Tracks: 0 / 0 / 1.75 / 3.92 / Solar PV Array area and Solar Stations: 0 / 0 / 122.92 / 311.31 / Consolidated BESS Compound: 0 / 0 / 0.72 / 6.07 / Community Orchards: 0 / 0 / 0.62 / 1.2 / Proposed Belt of Trees: 0 / 0 / 0 / 0.34 / Retained Arable and Grassland: 0 / 0 / 116.28 / 191.73 / Proposed Species Rich Grassland: 0 / 0 / 0 / 3.48 / Bird Mitigation Area - Permanent Grassland: 0 / 0 / 5.61 / 58.88 / Bird Mitigation Area - Managed Arable: 0 / 0 / 34.06 / 122.61 / The Applicant agrees that the detailed SMP should include a full description of the reinstatement methods for each component of the Proposed Development to ensure effective soil management and the preservation of BMV where relevant. As such, the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** has been updated to clarify this point and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 7.1.1 of the Framework SMP now reads: "*Prior to construction, site and soil-specific measures will be set out in a SMP, based upon this FSMP as a minimum, and supplemented by additional survey data where required. The detailed SMP will set out in full the methods for reinstatement (as relevant) to ensure the soil resource is managed effectively according to its ALC, and BMV resource is retained (as relevant) across the DCO Site*".

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Natural England Relevant Representation	Response to Natural England Relevant Representation
			The detailed SMP will be prepared substantially in accordance with the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**, as secured via Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. As noted above, sub-paragraph (1) of Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** has been updated to include Natural England as a named consultee, and as such Natural England will have the opportunity to review the detailed SMP prior to any approval.
	19	**Other Comments: NE19 Biodiversity Net Gain** NE have not reviewed the Biodiversity Net Gain Report ((APP-194)) and metric calculations in detail, however, it is noted that the Report indicates that the proposed development will create gains of 30.64% in Habitat units, 50.62% in Hedgerow unis and 11.83% in Watercourse units. This is welcomed. DCO (APP-016) Requirement 8 – LEMP – secures minimum gains of 30% in habitat units, 50% in Hedgerow units and 10% in watercourse units. This is welcomed. NE's comments on BNG have not been attributed a RAG score, as BNG is not a mandatory requirement for the project	The Applicant notes this comment.
	20	**Other Comments: NE20 Ancient Woodland** No ancient woodland is located within the order limits, although several blocks are located within 2km. There are also several Ancient and Veteran Trees located within the Order Limits. Natural England welcome the approach to retain all Ancient and Veteran Trees within the Order Limits, and note the commitment made in the Design Approach Document (APP-186) Table A-1, including EC3, to retain a 15m buffer from all ancient woodland, and establish similar buffer zones from all ancient/veteran trees based on their individual root protection zones. In the absence of direct effects or loss of Ancient Woodland and Ancient/Veteran Trees, Natural England have no specific comment to make in this regard and refer to Standing Advice.	The Applicant notes this comment.
	21	**Other Comments: NE21 Connecting People with Nature** It is noted that three Public Rights of Way will be permanently diverted as a result of the project; whilst we have no specific comment to make, Natural England welcome the inclusion of the framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan (APP-195) to avoid disruption as far as practicable. NE also welcome the inclusion of several permissive paths through the order limits, to enhance the connectivity of the existing Public Rights of Way network. DCO (APP-016) Requirement 18 – secures the detailed Public Rights of Way Management Plan. This is welcomed.	The Applicant notes this comment.

2.4 Historic England

Table 2-4: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Historic England

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Historic England Relevant Representation	Response to Historic England Relevant Representation
RR-107	**1**	**Authorship** Currently, no authors are identified. Identifying authorship would enhance transparency and enable readers to assess the qualifications and expertise of the authors and contributors. We are pleased to see specialists identified by name in the WSI (Appendix 7-H).	Authorship Relevant qualifications and experience of the Cultural Heritage ES Technical Lead (at Cotswold Archaeology), providing oversight and quality assurance of all relevant deliverables, are included in the Appendix 1-C: Statement of Competence of the ES **[APP-120]**. In addition, relevant acknowledgements of the specialist teams are also listed in the Appendix 7-G: Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report of the ES **[APP-130]** page vi, and in Appendix 7-F: Air Photo and LiDAR Mapping and Interpretation of the ES **[APP-129]**.
	2	**Built Heritage** In our previous advice, we recommended that; 'further assessment is undertaken of views toward the village of Aubourn. When approaching from the south, proposed solar infrastructure in the field at grid reference SK 91590 62042 has the potential to impact views towards the medieval Old Church, NHLE listing entry number 1360538. It is recommended to further assess the impact of proposed solar infrastructure in this location in relation to the GII listed former church'. The applicant has provided a 'Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment' within the Environmental Statement (Table 7-1) which notes in relation to the Old Church; 'The key aspects of the asset's setting include its arrangement at the junction of Bassingham Road, Church Road and Bridge Road; its experience within the churchyard, its association with the settlement of Aubourn and surrounding rural landscape, and views in which the asset can be experienced within its key setting'. We consider that the Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment is reductive in terms of analysis. We note the growth in hedge height in recent months, however we still believe that the field at grid reference SK 91590 62042 ('the field') does contribute to the significance of Aubourn and the Old Church due to its prominence in views toward both assets in views on approach, along with contributing to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset Grange Cottage on approach from south. Furthermore, the particular views that we highlighted for further assessment do not appear to have been included in views assessment work undertaken so far. The overall Fosse Green Energy Project scheme will inevitably erode the rural context and experience of the village of Aubourn, including in kinetic views on approach from the south. To address this we consider that the removal of panels from the field would reduce this impact. This is a modification that we had hoped to see reflected in the most recent iteration of the scheme. We consider that the removal of panels from this location is a proportionate response to the impact of the scheme overall and would represent some mitigation of heritage impact.	Built Heritage The Applicant appreciates the comments and engagement from Historic England throughout the process, including both remote and in-person meetings. Following the completion of Appendix 7-D: Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]** and submission of the ES documents, an in-person meeting to discuss the layout of the Proposed Development in proximity to Grange Cottage and heritage assets at Aubourn was held on site on 15 September 2025. In response to Historic England (as well as other stakeholders') concerns regarding the proximity of solar PV to Grange Cottage and heritage assets at Aubourn, the Proposed Development design has been amended to remove panels from the field immediately south-east of Grange Cottage (i.e. Field 46 – 'the field' referenced in this response). This is secured via the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, and other secured Plans, which have been submitted to the Examination as part of Change Request 1 **[AS-103]**. The outcomes of these consultations are summarised within the SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England (which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**) and the changes reflected within updated Works Plans **[AS-105]**, Landscape Mitigation Plan (included within the Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) **[AS-122]**), and photomontages (Figure 10-10 of the ES **[APP-119]**) which, as noted above, have been submitted to the Examination as part of Change Request 1 **[AS-103]**.
	3	**Appendix 7-G: Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report**	Appendix 7-G: Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Historic England Relevant Representation	Response to Historic England Relevant Representation
		The interpretation may be somewhat cautious regarding areas affected by geological noise. For instance, the possible presence of periglacial cracking in the vicinity of CRC 049.02 and 050.02 (in the area of the cable route which—at the time of the production of the documents—has yet to be trenched) could be obscuring additional archaeological features, which warrants further consideration.	The Applicant recognises the limitation of the geophysical survey in certain areas affected by 'noise' from geological responses. The Cable Corridor was not subject to trial trenching at this stage, as detailed design for this area is yet to be developed. As part of an iterative approach to the detailed design process, the locations for construction activities associated with the Cable Corridor will be fed into the design for a programme of further trial trenching work, which will in turn inform the design process and appropriate mitigation measures. This staged approach to further investigation of those additional areas is presented within the Framework Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) **[AS-001]** which will be finalised following completion of the Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**) and submitted to the Examination at a future Examination deadline. The comments regarding potential for additional archaeological remains will be addressed within relevant site specific WSIs which will be prepared for submission to and approval by the relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA) prior to the carrying out of any archaeological works. In line with Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, updates will be made to the Framework WSI to account for the results of additional trial trenching carried out and the updated Framework WSI will be submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant LPA in consultation with Historic England.
	4	**Appendix 7-H: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation** In paragraph 3.4 it is stated that the reference to the East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework (EMHERF) will only be made 'if significant archaeological remains are identified. We consider that this is inappropriate. The research framework is a tool which can help identify what is important and provides research questions and objectives that can help ensure work is appropriately and proportionately targeted. In future iterations to this, or any new Specific WSIs produced for post-DCO work, we would expect EMHERF to be integrated from the start. Paragraph 4.8 states that 'Artefacts from topsoil, subsoil and unstratified contexts will normally be noted but not retained unless they are of intrinsic interest'. However, the criteria for determining what constitutes 'intrinsic interest' are not defined. Without further clarification, there is a risk that important artefacts or assemblages may be overlooked or discarded. The paragraph further notes that 'All artefacts from stratified excavated contexts will be collected, except for large assemblages of post-medieval or modern material. Such material may be noted and not retained or, if appropriate, a representative sample may be collected and retained'. As currently worded, this approach is problematic. Decisions regarding retention should not be based solely on the estimated chronological period of the material. Post-medieval or early modern assemblages may, in some cases, be of greater significance than those from earlier periods. There may also be problems where field staff mistakenly discard material they believe to be of recent origin, when a specialist could have identified it as being earlier (glazed ceramics, for example, can be prone to such misidentification). Any retention strategy should be developed in consultation with appropriate finds specialists and agreed upon with the receiving archive. It should be guided by the significance and research potential of the assemblage, rather than its date. More meaningful integration of relevant standards and guidance—such as those provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2022)—would help ensure transparency and consistency in the decision-making process. We recommend that the remaining trenching and future Specific WSIs address these issues and look forward to seeing a fuller version of the WSI in due course.	Appendix 7-H: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation The Appendix 7-H: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation of the ES **[APP-131]** was subject to consultation with the archaeological advisor at LCC and was approved on 7 May 2025, prior to the evaluation commencing. However, the Applicant notes the comments from Historic England which can as appropriate be addressed via future site specific WSIs, which will be prepared for submission to and approval by the relevant LPA prior to the carrying out of any further archaeological evaluation or mitigation.
	5	**Appendix 7-I: Trial Trenching Report (Interim)**	Appendix 7-I: Trial Trenching Report (Interim)

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Historic England Relevant Representation	Response to Historic England Relevant Representation
		Paragraph 2.7 notes that 'Deposits were assessed for their palaeoenvironmental potential and samples were taken in accordance with CA Technical Manual 2'. However, no accompanying list of the samples taken has been provided. Including such a summary would be valuable in helping understand the extent of sampling undertaken to date and identify any potential gaps in the evidence base that may need to be addressed. We appreciate that it is an interim report. However, it would be helpful to include a provisional summary table of finds (where possible) to provide context alongside the interpretation. As it stands, statements like 'This may suggest that the features were not particularly finds rich' (paragraph 4.3) are difficult to assess without supporting data. This is particularly relevant given the weaknesses in the WSI with regards to finds selection and retention.	The Applicant acknowledges that Appendix 7-I: Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]** did not provide additional information regarding sampling undertaken. This is due to the ongoing nature of the trial trenching works at the point of submission of the DCO application. However, the Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**), is currently under preparation and to be submitted to the Examination at a future Examination deadline, and will enable a detailed consideration of the relevant data as part of the decision making process. The Final Trial Trenching Report includes the discussion of finds and palaeoenvironmental evidence. This was issued for comment to LCC and Historic England on 9 December 2025.
	6	**6.1 Environmental Statement – Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage** It is helpful, and encouraging, to note the observation made in point (e) of paragraph 7.5.1, which highlights the strong correlation to date between the geophysical survey results and the trial trenching. However, it is worth noting that the trenching reported so far has been conducted within an area of mudstone geology. As fieldwork progresses towards the limestone formations of the Lincoln Cliff, the degree of correlation between geophysical data and trenching results may vary. Current references to preservation (such as in the Framework Written Scheme of Investigation, see paragraph 3.12-.16) refer only to construction phase activities, and there appears to be no reference to residual operational effects on buried archaeology within the current documentation. It would be beneficial to include a clear commitment to identifying and documenting the locations of preserved archaeological areas, and to ensuring that this information is safeguarded for the long-term management of the site once operational. As outlined in Historic England's guidance Preserving Archaeological Remains (2016), reburied or surviving archaeological features on a site constitute a form of 'residual risk' for those inheriting or managing the site. There is a duty of care to inform the client, as well as any future contractors, owners, or occupiers, of these risks, particularly where they may affect future site use, maintenance, or modification. The recently updated Appendix 5 of the guidance provides a useful framework for the type of information that should be documented and passed on to ensure appropriate stewardship of archaeological remains: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/preserving-archaeological-remains/	6.1 Environmental Statement – Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage The Applicant appreciates Historic England's advice with regard to further fieldwork, and the change in geology across the Order Limits. Appropriate approach to further evaluation and mitigation will be addressed within relevant site specific WSIs which will be prepared for submission to and approval by the relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA) prior to the carrying out of any archaeological works. With regard to the treatment of preserved archaeological remains during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** highlights that measures addressing unforeseen potential impacts upon archaeological remains will be included within the detailed OEMP, which places responsibility for the overall management upon the Operator of the Proposed Development. The Framework WSI **[AS-001]**, which will be finalised following completion of the Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**) is to be submitted at a future Examination deadline, and will also reflect on the need for appropriate measures during operation (via detailed OEMP), depending on detailed design and resultant impacts.

2.5 Anglian Water Services

Table 2-5: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: Anglian Water Services

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation	Response to Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation
RR-024	1	The Potential Main Issues for Examination (application document APP-193) shows the numerous issues that AWS has raised, through the public consultation and subsequent engagement with the Applicant, which are predominantly marked as Amber in the RAG rating within Table 3-1 Status of Issues with Anglian Water and are still to be concluded on.	A SoCG between the Applicant and Anglian Water Services (AWS) is currently under preparation, which covers the points raised in AWS's Relevant Representation, and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The SoCG supersedes the matters identified in the Potential Main Issues for Examination. Following receipt of AWS's Relevant Representation, the Applicant's position with regard to the issues previously raised under the Potential Main Issues for Examination marked as 'Amber' (i.e. 'Under Discussion') in the RAG rating has been updated and incorporated within the SoCG. Accordingly, the SoCG to be submitted at the midpoint of Examination provides AWS's and the Applicant's current position on issues raised and should be referred to as the primary document capturing areas of agreement and any remaining matters requiring discussion between the Applicant and AWS for examination.
	2	A copy of AWS's template Bespoke Protective Provisions (BPPs) has been supplied and an exchange made with comments. AWS would welcome further discussions regarding these as they have not been included in the dDCO 'Schedule 14 Article 44 Protective Provisions Part 1 For The Protection Of Electricity, Gas, Water And Sewerage Undertakers' (application document APP-016). Although the Explanatory Memorandum to the dDCO (application document APP-019) refers to on-going discussions taking place with statutory undertakers to progress an agreed form of BPPs this is disappointing as AWS has sought to engage on this matter. AWS is, therefore, obliged at this stage to object to the inclusion of the "standard" set of protective provisions for the benefit of statutory undertakers contained the dDCO. AWS considers these to fall short of providing it with the necessary protections. Further reasons for BPPs are set out in more detail below.	The Applicant is currently negotiating bespoke protective provisions with AWS. Protective provisions are substantively agreed between the parties, and the Applicant is confident these will be agreed and can be included in Schedule 14 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** at or before the midpoint of the examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The Applicant took the approach at submission of the DCO Application to not include any bespoke protective provisions that were still under negotiation in the Draft DCO, until they had been agreed between the parties. The provisions protect the apparatus of AWS and specify that AWS retains its rights and powers over its apparatus, even if streets are stopped up or diverted, ensuring access and maintenance capabilities are preserved. The protective provisions also include provisions for cooperation between the undertaker and AWS to ensure safety and efficiency in executing works. The Applicant believes that the provisions will provide a fair balance between protecting AWS's infrastructure and allowing the Applicant to proceed with the Proposed Development without risking significant delays or harm to any infrastructure.
	3	The submission of an agreed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) would be beneficial. If no connections or interfaces with our assets are identified or specific arrangements are needed to be put in place, then it would be helpful to log this in an SoCG.	As part of the Examination process, a SoCG between the Applicant and AWS is currently under preparation which covers the points raised in AWS's Relevant Representation including connections and interfaces, and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
	4	Book of Reference (application document APP-022) and Works Plans (application document APP-008) AWS's initial investigation has highlighted that the Book of Reference and associated documents are potentially incomplete with respect to easements and assets within these documents.	The Applicant acknowledges that AWS has various interests in respect of rights and apparatus within the Order Limits. The Applicant's current understanding of the interests in terms of land plots that have been identified can be found within the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and can be identified on the Land Plans **[AS-104]**. The Applicant will continue to engage with the relevant estates team to ensure the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and associated documents are accurate and up to date.
	5	A land interest questionnaire (LiQ) was undertaken in August 2024. AWS requests that these documents are updated through a full boundary check to reflect an accurate account of AWS's land interests within the Project's order limits.	The Applicant will continue to engage with the relevant estates team to ensure the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and associated documents are accurate and up to date.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation	Response to Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation
		For further LiQ enquiries relating to AWS's above ground assets and formal easements, the Applicant should contact our estates team on: awsestates@savills.com	
	6	Interfaces between the Project and AWS assets (underground and surface assets) AWS owns and operates the water supply and sewerage infrastructure within the order limits. In locations where the Project intersects with these assets, measures will need to be in place to ensure their protection and operational continuity of water and sewerage services to customers will be required, including BPPs referenced above.	The Applicant is currently negotiating bespoke protective provisions with AWS. Negotiations are ongoing to ensure that AWS can continue to operate, maintain, and access their existing infrastructure. A clash detection exercise will be undertaken at the earliest opportunity during the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development and any AWS assets identified would be appropriately avoided by design to ensure their protection and operational continuity. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1) notes: *"To identify any existing infrastructure constraints, both consultation and a desk-based study will be undertaken prior to construction so that appropriate mitigation such as buffers can be incorporated into the design. Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) scans will also be used by Contractors to check for buried utilities prior to earth breaking site activities. The Applicant will endeavour to engage with utilities providers as appropriate."* Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	7	The design of the Project should minimise interaction with AWS assets/ critical infrastructure and specifically to avoid the need for mitigation works and diversions which have associated carbon costs. This may include the need for the panels to be positioned in such a way to avoid underground assets, as they may not be able to diverted in all situations.	The Applicant previously engaged with AWS regarding clash detection, and it was noted by the Applicant that a full clash detection exercise would be procured at the detailed design stage, when the design detail for the Proposed Development is more precise. A concept design has been submitted as part of the DCO Application which incorporates spatial flexibility within the Proposed Development Parameters to account for if localised constraints are identified later in the process. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1) notes: *"To identify any existing infrastructure constraints, both consultation and a desk-based study will be undertaken prior to construction so that appropriate mitigation such as buffers can be incorporated into the design. Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) scans will also be used by Contractors to check for buried utilities prior to earth breaking site activities. The Applicant will endeavour to engage with utilities providers as appropriate."* The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The clash detection exercise would be undertaken at the earliest opportunity during the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development and any AWS assets identified would be appropriately avoided by design.
	8	Through previous consultation stages, AWS has identified some notable assets within or in the vicinity of the order limits. There are a number of existing underground assets, including strategic supply pipelines which are in the Project's order limits. Water recycling assets including foul sewers are within the village areas and so are within the Cable Route corridor.	The clash detection exercise will be undertaken at the earliest opportunity during the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development and any AWS assets identified would be appropriately avoided by design. The draft protective provisions to be included in Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** also provide for various offsets from AWS assets depending on the size of such assets and therefore provide additional protection.
	9	Chapter 24 Other Environmental Matters of the ES (application document APP-039) acknowledges the construction of the Project has the potential to affect above below ground utility infrastructure (existing or planned).	As stated in Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]** (ref. paragraph 14.6.35), consultation with utilities providers and a desk-based study will be undertaken post-consent so that appropriate mitigation such as buffers can be incorporated into the detailed design of the Proposed Development. Where necessary, Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) scans will also be used by Contractors to check for buried utilities prior to earth breaking site activities, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1). The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation	Response to Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation
			Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Applicant will continue to engage with utilities providers as appropriate.
	10	AWS has sought to engage with the Applicant to carry out a clash detection and technical assurance review of the Project in relation to AW assets in order to confirm, for example, any sensitive plant, open cut locations, access works, diversions any above ground plant and shared access locations. Based on plans supplied to us by the Applicant, we have indicated that there at least in the region of 50 assets impacted of both clean water and foul water assets and other apparatus such as pumping stations, water recycling centres/ sewage treatments works. AWS is also constructing a strategic pipeline between Lincoln and Grantham and this is located within the eastern extent of the Cable Corridor between Coleby and Boothby Graffoe. Given the substantial number of other AWS projects being delivered in this Asset Management Period AMP8 (2025-2030), there is a strong advantage to having upfront discussions with AWS in relation to our asset interfaces with the Project. We strongly recommend that this assessment be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. This ensures clarity, reduces risk, and supports the timely and efficient delivery of the Project.	The Applicant is currently negotiating bespoke protective provisions with AWS with regards to AWS assets identified within the Order Limits. The Applicant has engaged with AWS regarding clash detection, and it was noted by the Applicant that a full clash detection exercise would be procured at the detailed design stage, when the design detail for the Proposed Development is more precise. A concept design has been submitted as part of the DCO Application which incorporates spatial flexibility within the Proposed Development Parameters to account for if localised constraints are identified later in the process. The clash detection exercise would be undertaken at the earliest opportunity during the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development and any AWS assets identified would be appropriately avoided by design. The draft protective provisions to be included in Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** also provide for various offsets from AWS assets depending on the size of such assets, so provide additional protection for these.
	11	We would not agree that a review of utilities plans is used to inform plans for proposed works prior to construction, as also indicated in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (application document APP-189). Further discussion is required between AWS and the Applicant to confirm these aspects, for example, trenchless crossings, ducting, open cut locations, access works, likely diversions, any above ground plant, and shared access locations. These matters should be addressed in supporting documents and will need to be amended accordingly as these matters are agreed.	The Applicant agrees to further discussions with AWS on these items. Measure MAD-C1 of Table 13 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline for clarity. Measure MAD-C1 now includes: *"Prior to the detailed design of the Proposed Development, further discussions will be held with Anglian Water to confirm aspects of the Proposed Development that have the potential to interact with utilities, such as trenchless crossings, ducting and open cut locations."* The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	12	Water Resources and Water Recycling/ Sewerage Services Water supply AWS has previously submitted representations stating the Project is proposed within an area of serious water stress designated by the Environment Agency. Information has been provided to the Applicant about regarding the process for making requests for water supply for both domestic and non-domestic purposes. This included copies of our policy position statement on water requests for non-domestic purposes for over 20m3 per day and a Water Resources Assessment (WRA) to be completed. It is not considered that the need for potable water (domestic and non-domestic purposes) for the different stages of the Project has been adequately addressed in the ES. A copy of the WRA has not been included with the application, as requested by both AWS and the Environment Agency, for review in order provide clarity on what the water requirements for the Project are and what assumptions have been made. This is relevant to all stages of the Project – construction, operation and decommissioning.	The Water Resources Assessment (WRA) completed for AWS consultation will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The WRA includes best estimates of water use at the time of the DCO submission. It includes requirements for water for domestic purposes during construction and operation, as well as non-domestic purposes. Decommissioning was not included in the WRA and nor did AWS request further information on this when the WRA was submitted. However, the water supply requirement during the decommissioning phase would be expected to be less than that required at the construction stage as processes such as concrete preparation and bentonite clay mixing would not be expected to be required. In response to the WRA submission, AWS confirmed on 28 May 2025 via email that they are able to provide the Applicant with the water to meet all of the outlined requirements (both domestic and non-domestic) during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, AWS confirmed on 23 December 2025 that they are also able to provide the Applicant with the water required for HDD activities. On this basis, the water assessment conclusions presented in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** are considered suitably robust given that they align with the assumptions of the WRA. However, it is acknowledged that the evidence base for the ES assessment was the WRA and subsequent AWS response, which was not included within the DCO application. As outlined above, this is to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline and thereby supports the conclusions of the assessment presented in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation	Response to Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation
	13	To clarify, a completed WRA form has been submitted to AWS during 2025. AWS has confirmed that following an initial assessment for a supply of water (both domestic and non-domestic) during construction and operation, which is higher rate than we are normally able to provide i.e. 20m3/d, the rate of water can be supported within a Water Resource Zone. However, no local network capacity assessment has been carried out and the Applicant has been advised to submit a pre-planning enquiry (PPE) prior to any DCO approval. AWS has, therefore, only at this stage confirmed the rate of water acceptance.	AWS confirmed via email on 28 May 2025 that "*we are able to provide you with the water to meet all of your requirements (both domestic and non-domestic) during construction and during operation.* *Once you have DCO approval, please append this email to your new mains connections applications on our inflow portal, so that the team know they can progress (given that the water required is slightly above the 20m3/d that we typically are allowing)*". As noted in the relevant representation with regard to local network capacity assessment, the email further advised that there would be a need to determine the scale of any offsite infrastructure upgrade required to enable AWS to meet the needs of the Proposed Development. This would also enable determination of the likely upgrade costs that are payable by the Applicant. The Applicant has submitted a pre-planning enquiry to AWS and will provide a further update at a future Examination deadline.
	14	Some detail on the need for water usage on a permanent basis for the Project is set out under the Chapter 9 – Water Environment (application document APP-034). This states that due to the nature of the Project there would be a requirement for a permanent water supply during operation. Confirmation is not given on the temporary requirements for water supply at the construction and decommissioning stages. This should be confirmed as it is likely that the former will require the most amount of water resource.	It is confirmed that the water supply requirements will be greatest for the Proposed Development during the construction phase. The WRA completed for AWS consultation will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The WRA includes best estimates of water use at the time of the DCO submission. It includes requirements for water for domestic purposes during the construction and operational phases, as well as non-domestic purposes. Given the submission of water use estimates and AWS's positive response to the WRA, it is considered that the outcomes of the impact assessment undertaken in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**, which align with the assumptions of the WRA, are suitably robust.
	15	The source of water supply for local firefighting provision has also not been specified in detail in terms of the source of water requirements.	The need for a single fill of fire water tanks from the Anglian Water supply was included in the WRA. The WRA completed for AWS consultation will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Given the submission of water use estimates (including fill of fire water tanks) and AWS's positive response to the WRA it is considered that the outcomes of the impact assessment undertaken in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** are suitably robust.
	16	Water consumption associated with future site users should be minimised using appropriate water efficiency measures. No details appear to have been provided on this aspect.	While not submitted with the DCO application, the WRA outlines that the Applicant has committed to ensuring water efficiency measures are adopted. A number of steps were outlined to this end within the WRA, including the use of rainwater harvesting and use of water efficiency measures in welfare facilities. These measures will be further developed at the detailed design stage. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** will be updated to further clarify this commitment and submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** at WAT-01 notes: • *"Rainwater harvesting is to be implemented on site to capture potential run off for the use of grey water across the Proposed Development.* • *Water efficiency measures will be implemented into all welfare facilities located on the constructed site, this includes low flow toilets and other washing conveniences."* The provision of a detailed OEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework OEMP, is secured via Requirement 13 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	17	It is considered that further consideration should be given to these matters in order that they are adequately addressed in terms of the Project and also be confirmed in the SoCG.	As part of the Examination process, a SoCG between the Applicant and AWS is currently under preparation, which includes the points raised by AWS about water supply and water consumption associated with future site users, and will be submitted at the midpoint of

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation	Response to Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation
			Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
	18	Water recycling/ Sewerage services Chapter 9 - Water Environment (application document APP-034) and The Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy (application document APP-147) both state that 1) due to the low daily occupancy only small volumes of foul drainage will be generated at the operational stage and, 2) the location of the facilities in relation to the public sewer, waste water will be managed using a self-contained foul drainage system to a sealed cesspit. These tanks would be regularly emptied under contract with a registered recycling and waste management contractor. AWS wishes to state that it should not be implied or agreed that any wastewater collected by the licensed waste carrier will be received at one of its sites for processing.	The Applicant notes this comment. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. WAT-C6) notes that "*any wastewater/drilling products that are not recycled will be stored and removed from the DCO Site by a suitable waste management contractor and disposed of at a licenced wastewater facility*". It would be for the licensed waste carrier to dispose of the wastewater in keeping with their own permits and agreements. The final disposal location is not known at this time as it will depend on the contractor appointed.
	19	It is assumed that no wastewater connections are required on a temporary basis. On the basis, that construction stage activities such as concrete production have no requirement for an on-site wastewater connection, this should be clarified.	Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** (ref. paragraph 9.7.68) states: "*No new connections to foul water infrastructure are considered to be required for the Proposed Development*". The Applicant confirms there will be no temporary wastewater connection to the public sewer during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
	20	If the Applicant confirms that it does not require the use of the public sewer network to manage additional foul water drainage system and (if any) surface water flows, there would then be no need for the dDCO to include any provisions providing for a general right to connect to any of AWS's wastewater assets. See further comment below regarding Schedule 2 Requirements Part 10 of the dDCO.	The Applicant confirms that it does not require the use of the public sewer network to manage additional foul water drainage system or surface water flows. Therefore, the Draft DCO would not need to include any provisions providing for a general right to connect to any of AWS's wastewater assets.
	21	Flooding and surface water drainage AWS is responsible for management of the risks of flooding from surface water which are directed to foul water or combined water sewer systems. Our advice on surface water management is available here: Sustainable surface water drainage	The Applicant notes this advice. Surface water drainage will not be directed to foul water or combined water sewer systems. Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** of the ES sets out the approach to surface water management.
	22	Potential embedded design measures should include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to be utilised at permanent above ground installations to manage rainfall run-off and achieve sufficient attenuation to avoid increases in flood risk, and compensation flood storage at temporary site compounds to manage flood risk at these locations.	Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** of the ES sets out the approach to surface water management and includes the use of SuDS. The impact on flood risk from all sources (including surface water runoff) has been assessed within Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES **[APP-146]** and the outcome of this assessment indicates no increase in flood risk from any source within the Order Limits, or elsewhere with the proposed embedded mitigation in place.
	23	AWS will not accommodate any surface water run-off into a foul sewer, and only to a combined sewer in exceptional circumstances. Our preference would be for surface water run-off from above ground permanent buildings and impermeable surfacing to be managed by SuDS with any outfall to a watercourse, in accordance with the drainage hierarchy.	Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** of the ES sets out the approach to surface water management. Surface water runoff will be collected and drained to surface water bodies, either to watercourses, or in certain cases, to ground where a watercourse is not present in the vicinity. No surface water drainage will be discharged to a public sewer during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
	24	The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (application document APP-146) and Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy (application document APP-147) should consider any increased risk of surface water and groundwater flood risks arising from the scheme that could exacerbate sewer flooding risks due to infiltration/ingress to our networks. The likelihood of more extreme weather events leading to higher-than-average rainfall and cumulative impacts of storm events, as recently experienced during Winter 2023/24, mean that infrastructure becomes increasingly vulnerable to flood risk. The Project should aim to minimise any flood risks as far as possible by designing in measures to limit increased flood risks to utilities infrastructure.	The Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** discusses sewer flood risk for both the Principal Site and the Cable Corridor. Paragraph 4.6.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment notes that the Proposed Development does not interact with or alter any existing sewer infrastructure and therefore will result in no change to flood risk from such sources. Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** of the ES sets out the approach to surface water management. Surface water runoff will be collected and drained to surface water bodies, either to watercourses, or in certain cases, to ground where a watercourse is not present in the vicinity. No surface water drainage will be discharged to a public sewer during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The risk of exposing or damaging sewers during the construction phase of the Proposed Development will be managed by the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1) with regards

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation	Response to Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation
			to the identification of any existing infrastructure constraints through both consultation and desk-based study prior to construction so that appropriate mitigation can be incorporated into the design.
	25	Flooding from other sources should include reference to AWS infrastructure and further detail provided regarding potential temporary effects on flood risk from third party infrastructure works during construction of the Project should be provided in the FRA, given the interfaces between the Project and AWS assets. These interfaces will also be managed through the Protective Provisions and agreed construction practices.	The Applicant is currently negotiating bespoke protective provisions with AWS in relation to AWS assets identified within the Order Limits. The Flood Risk Assessment **[APP-146]** discusses sewer flood risk for both the Principal Site and the Cable Corridor, pre and post development. Paragraph 4.6.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment notes that the Proposed Development does not interact with or alter any existing sewer infrastructure and therefore will result in no change to flood risk from such sources. The Flood Risk Assessment assesses the impacts primarily during the Operational phase of the Proposed Development. The construction phase, construction methodologies, impacts and mitigation are included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** which considers potential construction impacts on sewer infrastructure.
	26	The Applicant should confirm to AWS that it does not require the use of the public sewer network to manage additional surface water flows. If no connection is intended to be made, there would then be no need for the dDCO Order under Requirement 10 at Schedule 2 (application document APP-016) to include any provisions providing for a general right to connect to any of AWS's assets.	The Applicant confirms that it does not require the use of the public sewer network to manage additional surface water flows. Requirement 10 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** does not currently provide for a general right to connect to any of AWS's wastewater assets and it is not currently the intention of the Applicant to change this.
	27	Notwithstanding the lead roles of the Lead Local Flood Authority, the Environment Agency and the Internal Drainage Boards, AWS would welcome clarification on how resultant impacts on the local drainage/ sewerage network will be designed as part of the scheme.	Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** of the ES sets out the approach to surface water management. Surface water runoff will be collected and drained to surface water bodies, either to watercourses, or in certain cases, to ground where a watercourse is not present in the vicinity. No surface water drainage will be discharged to a public sewer during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
	28	AWS reserves its position on the need to be included as a consultee to the drainage management plan, including the relevant dDCO for any discharge of requirements in relation to drainage plans and surface water discharge.	The Applicant acknowledges this request and agrees to include Anglian Water Services as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 10(1) (Surface and foul water drainage), and an updated version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.
	29	Framework management plan documents: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (application document APP-189) Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (application document APP-190) Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (application document APP-191) Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (application document APP-199) AWS notes the submission of the above framework documents. AWS would welcome specific reference on how the interfaces with utility assets such as for sewers and water supply within the Order Limits will be managed through the construction of haul roads, bellmouths. See above comments relating to identifying where there will be potential interfaces with our assets and how this should be investigated as early as possible. These documents should include steps to remove the risk of damage to AWS assets from plant and machinery (compaction and vibration during the construction phase) including any haul and access roads and crossings.	The Applicant acknowledges this request - as noted above, measure MAD-C1 of Table 13 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to clarify that the Applicant will hold discussions with Anglian Water prior to the detailed design stage to discuss potential interferences with utility assets. Measure GC-C1 now includes: *"Prior to the detailed design of the Proposed Development, further discussions will be held with Anglian Water to confirm aspects of the Proposed Development that have the potential to interact with utilities, such as trenchless crossings, ducting and open cut locations."*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation	Response to Anglian Water Services Relevant Representation
	30	AWS would seek to ensure that 24 hours /7-day access to our assets is not compromised.	The Applicant is currently negotiating bespoke protective provisions with AWS with regards to AWS assets identified within the Order Limits. Negotiations are ongoing to ensure that AWS can continue to operate, maintain, and access their existing infrastructure.
	31	Whilst Protective Provisions should address those interfaces with our assets, we would welcome further discussion with the Applicant regarding such matters and their inclusion in the finalised documents. AWS reserves its position on the need to be included as a consultee to these detailed management plans, including the relevant dDCO for any discharge of requirements relating to these.	The Applicant is currently negotiating bespoke protective provisions with AWS with regards to AWS assets identified within the Order Limits. The Applicant is committed to ongoing engagement with AWS to ensure that such matters are appropriately addressed and secured within the finalised Protective Provisions. The Applicant acknowledges the request for AWS to be consulted on the development of relevant detailed management plans, and any discharges of requirements is undertaken as appropriate.

2.6 UK Health Security Agency

Table 2-6: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: UK Health Security Agency

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from UK Health Security Agency Relevant Representation	Response to UK Health Security Agency Relevant Representation
RR-285	1	Environmental Public Health Regarding a potential fire occurring at the Battery Energy System Storage (BESS), the applicant has modelled potential hydrogen fluoride (HF) emissions to air, finding that short term concentrations will not exceed AEGL-1 (acute exposure guideline levels) at locations beyond 200m. However, the modelling results presented do not detail the BESS location(s) in comparison with sensitive receptors, which would be needed to contextualise the potential plume impact. Consideration should also be given to the potential off-site impacts on sensitive receptors of wider products of combustion (e.g. particulate matter) that could result during a fire.	The location of the BESS is dependent on the BESS arrangement that is progressed post-consent as part of the Proposed Development. Both centralised and distributed BESS arrangements are considered within the DCO application in accordance with the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach, as set out in Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**. For the distributed BESS arrangement option, the BESS units will be next to the Solar Stations, in a common compound each of which will be approximately 33m by 27m (0.09ha) in footprint. For the centralised BESS arrangement option, the BESS containers will be located in a centralised BESS Compound. The BESS Compound footprint will be approximately 315m by 165m. Refer to Figure 3-2A: Indicative Fixed South Facing Site Layout Plan **[AS-022]** and Figure 3-2B: Indicative Single Axis Tracker Site Layout Plan **[AS-023]** of the ES for the cartographical context which informed the modelling undertaken. The Applicant has committed to ensure a minimum buffer of 150m from the distributed BESS units to residential receptors, and 200m from the centralised BESS units to residential receptors, as set out within the Framework BSMP (ref. paragraph 2.3.5) **[APP-198]**, which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, as secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the relevant planning authority must consult with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue (LFRS) and the Environment Agency before determining an application for approval of the detailed BSMP. Appendix 14-G: Unplanned Emissions Assessment of the ES **[APP-176]** considers potential products of a thermal event and identifies hydrogen fluoride (HF) as the most relevant pollutant. All fires combusting any form of building or equipment will generate smoke, but long-term air quality objectives or targets for particulate matter (PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ size fractions) would not be placed at risk of not being met by a single fire event occurring over a timescale of hours.
	2	The Electromagnetic Field (EMF) The Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure estimates quoted in section 14.8 of the ES and Appendix 14-F refer to a graph used to illustrate "the comparison between the magnetic fields of a 400kV underground cable and an equivalent overhead line", and are not specific to the 400 kV cables in the proposed development (e.g. depth of the cable, current, cable layout) nor it is specified in the reference that the graph provides maximum magnetic field levels for 400 kV overhead lines in general. For potential EMF health impacts, UKHSA advises that according to the following voluntary Code of Practice, if the cable exceeds 132 kV, a calculation or measurement of the maximum fields directly above the cable is recommended to demonstrate compliance with ICNIRP exposure guidelines: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a796799ed915d07d35b5397/1256-code-practice-emf-public-exp-guidelines.pdf	As stated in Appendix 14-F: Electromagnetic Fields Assessment of the ES **[APP-175]** (ref. paragraph 1.1.19) exposure Limits in the UK are based upon the 1998 ICNIRP guidelines, on the advice of the Health Protection Agency (HPA). The ICNIRP 'reference levels' for the public are 100μT for magnetic fields and 5,000 volts per metre (or 5kV/m) for electric fields. These are the levels above which more investigation is needed if this level of exposure is likely to occur; the permitted levels of exposure are somewhat higher, 360μT and 9kV/m. They apply where the time of exposure is significant, for instance in a residence. As a worst-case the lower 'reference level' of 100μT and 5kV/m was used in assessment as the threshold at which potentially significant effects could occur. The National Grid document 'Undergrounding high voltage electricity transmission lines'[3] states that for a 400kV cable buried at 0.9 m depth, the typical magnetic field is 24 microteslas when on top of the cable and 3 microteslas at 5m from the centreline, with the maximum level known by National Grid being 96 microteslas on top of the cable at 0.9 m depth, and 13 microteslas at 5m. Taking into account this guidance and the UK limits set for safety of members of the public, the maximum reported electromagnetic field for the 400kV grid connection cables within the Cable Corridor of the Proposed Development buried at a minimum depth of 0.9m as per Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** (ref. Table 3-7) would comply with the ICNIRP limits and were therefore scoped out of the assessment. Therefore, it is not considered

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from UK Health Security Agency Relevant Representation	Response to UK Health Security Agency Relevant Representation
			necessary or that any value would be added by carrying out a calculation for the Proposed Development. The desk based secondary information on EMF emissions from 400kV cable circuits is considered sufficient at this stage, which is a concept design stage at which time the precise depth and location of the Cable Corridor is not known and will be determined at detailed design stage, post consent, with the parameters consented within the DCO. The secondary data is sufficient to demonstrate there will not be any likely significant effects or exceedances of safe thresholds for members of the public. Any future calculations, should UKHSA require it, would be better provided at detailed design stage, once the precise location and depth of the cable circuits are known.

2.7 National Highways

Table 2-7: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: National Highways (NH)

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
RR-201	1	NH does not object to the principle of the authorised development subject to the following concerns being resolved and the inclusion of our protective provisions: a. The book of reference as submitted by the Applicant identifies 10 plots of land owned or occupied by NH for the purposes of its undertaking ("Plots") in respect of which compulsory acquisition powers are sought. The compulsory acquisition powers sought are described in the book of reference as permanent acquisition of new rights ("Compulsory Powers"). To safeguard NH's interests and the safety and integrity of the Strategic Road Network ("SRN"), NH seeks further information from the Applicant to understand how the new rights will interact with National Highways' assets. b. The Authorised Development may impact on NH's major capital project, the A46 Newark Bypass Development Consent Order which received consent on 1st October 2025 by the Secretary of State for Transport. It is necessary for the protection of this project that the Applicant agrees to co-operate with NH in the delivery of the Authorised Development, in a way that safeguards the significant public investment that has been made by NH. Following the conclusion of the Government's Spending Review, funding for the A46 Newark Bypass scheme has now been confirmed. The Government and National Highways remain committed to maintaining a safe and reliable road network, necessary to stimulate economic growth and enhance opportunities across the country. In the coming months, National Highways will be working closely with Department for Transport to identify delivery timetables for this project. We will update the Applicant on delivery timings, as part of the next Road Investment Strategy which is scheduled to be published in March 2026. Please see our comments on the Schedule 2 requirements at paragraph 7.2 below and our comments on the CTMP at section 5 below. Additionally, we advise the applicant to work closely with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) to coordinate the Construction Traffic Management Plan for the A46 Hykeham Relief Road project, a scheme also impacted by the authorised development. This plan should be regularly reviewed and updated in line with construction progress. c. The DCO includes a number of provisions which authorise the interference with statutory powers belonging to NH and/or grant the Applicant powers over the SRN which would have significant safety implications if not properly and proportionately controlled through NH's protective provisions. d. NH requires additional information regarding the proposed works No 6 and 9 outlined in Schedule 1 to the draft order in relation to their impact on the SRN. The full nature and scope of the proposed works effecting the SRN is currently unclear. Without the appropriate level of information, it is not possible to effectively assess or manage the potential impact on the SRN. The inclusion of NH's protective provisions are required to ensure the necessary information is provided at the relevant stages. e. NH requires consultation on various requirements at Schedule 2 which will be discussed in further detail below Whilst the current **Draft DCO** does not include protective provisions for NH's benefit, negotiations with the Applicant are progressing well and we understand it is the Applicant's intention to include protective provisions for NH's benefit within the DCO. NH is prepared to withdraw its objection subject to the Applicant agreeing to the inclusion of the NH protective provisions in a form agreed by NH on the DCO.	The Applicant acknowledges National Highways' comments and will continue to work collaboratively with National Highways in matters relating to Transport and Access. Responses to items a - e are noted below: a. Within the plots along the A46 (4/3, 4/5, 4/10, 4/11, 4/13 and 2/7), as per the Book of Reference **[AS-115]**, it is proposed that cable crossings will be provided under the surface of NH land, installed via directional drilling. No direct interaction with the A46 carriageway or interference with the existing rights of NH is proposed. In terms of plots Plot 2/8, 2/10 and 2/11, it is proposed to create construction access C-002 and operational access O-002 (see Figure 3-1: Construction Compound and Access Locations of the ES **[AS-021]**) onto the public highway within the extents of this plot, and similarly within Plot 4/15 operational access O-003 is proposed to be created. It is not proposed to interfere with the existing rights of NH in either location. b. The Applicant will work with NH (and LCC) with respect to the A46 Newark Bypass (and A46 Hykeham Relief Road) in the development of the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to coordinate the delivery of these projects. As noted below, the Applicant agrees to include National Highways as a consultee within Requirement 14 of Schedule 2 and will submit a version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** with this change to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. It should be noted that the potential cumulative impact of the Proposed Development in combination with these schemes was considered in the ES. As set out in Appendix 15-A: Long List of Cumulative Developments of the ES **[APP-177]**, the A46 Hykeham Relief Road scheme (ID95) was progressed to the cumulative schemes shortlist, and is considered in the cumulative assessment presented in Section 13.10 of Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. With regards to the Newark Bypass (ID100), as set out in Appendix 15-A: Long List of Cumulative Developments of the ES **[APP-177]**, there is limited potential for the construction phase to overlap with that of the Proposed Development given the Proposed Development construction is proposed to commence in 2031, where it is anticipated that the A46 Newark Bypass will be constructed prior to this. As such, even if there are minor delays to ID100, there is no scope for operational cumulative effects. As such, this cumulative scheme was not progressed to the short list for cumulative assessment within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. c. Noted, please see responses below on protective provisions. d. Please refer to response below. e. Please refer to response below.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		NH reserves the right to produce additional grounds of objection to the Examining Authority as the DCO progresses should NH consider it necessary if any further information relating to the impact on the SRN comes to light or the negotiations on the protective provisions relapse.	
	2	Protecting SRN **The impact of works number 6 and 9 on the SRN** The Authorised Development is situated to the south-west of Lincoln. Bisecting the north of the site is the A46 trunk road , which is a dual carriageway subject to the national speed limit that forms part of the SRN. We note there will be interaction with the A46, at Work Numbers 6 and 9 which involves the laying of electrical cables under the SRN. We understand the construction/decommissioning phases are proposed to take between 24 to 30 months to complete, with commencement anticipated in 2031 and connection to the National Grid by 2033. The operational life of the development is expected to be 60 years, following which there will be the decommissioning phase. *Works No 6* *Works to lay electrical cables up to 33 kV connecting Work No. 1 to Work No. 2 or Work No. 3, and Work No. 4 including works to lay electrical and data cables; joint bays, link boxes, cable ducts, cable protection, joint protection and manholes; marker posts, underground cable marker, tiles and tape, communications chambers, fibre optic cables and lighting and other works associated with cable laying; and tunnelling, boring and drilling works including temporary compounds for the tunnelling, boring or drilling works.* The Indicative Trenchless Crossing Locations document (APP-059) show two trenchless cable crossings are proposed across the A46 trunk road. Regarding feasibility, the SRN ground conditions along the proposed cable route are suitable for a trenchless crossing. However, National Highways would like to understand if consideration has been given to a single crossing, as this would have less impact on the SRN and would be a cheaper option. We require further engagement from the Applicant through a business case for our approval for installing any new apparatus in / under our property. We need to understand how the cable route will interact with National Highways' assets and to determine if the cable crossing is feasible. National Highways require details of the cable crossings including: the cable alignment, duct diameter, capacity (whether more than 1 cable is to be provided for future capacity increased or redundancy/ contingency), confirmation on all parts of our SRN or land NH have an interest in that will be impacted by the proposed work. The cross-section information provided on ES Figure 3-13 Typical Trenchless Crossings Cross Sections (APP-060) is insufficient to determine the geotechnical risks on the A46 trunk road. Any proposed directional drilling under our network will require compliance with The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Chapter CD622 (Managing Geotechnical Risk). We advise the Applicant to review the requirements of CD622, which can be found on the Standards for Highways website. Consideration should also be given the potential impact of drilling upon other	Two trenchless crossing locations, as indicatively shown in Figure 3-12: Indicative Trenchless Crossing Locations of the ES **[AS-028]**, are proposed due to the wide area that the cables originate from. This will decrease the concentration of cables in one area and reduce the overall cable lengths required. The Applicant will work with NH regarding the location of the A46 crossings through the production of a feasibility study for these works. As requested by NH, this will include provision of further information on: • The cable duct specification (diameter, capacity, and whether multiple cables are proposed for future expansion or redundancy); • The proposed method of installation; and • Any related design or construction details. It should be noted that a design has been submitted as part of the DCO Application which incorporates spatial flexibility within the Proposed Development Parameters to account for any localised constraints which may be identified later in the process. As such, the purpose of Figure 3-13: Typical Trenchless Crossings Cross Sections of the ES **[APP-060]** is not to demonstrate the specific geotechnical risks on the A46 trunk road at specific crossing locations, whereby this could vary from location to location. The geotechnical risks will be established as part of the detailed design stage once final locations of the trenchless crossing locations are known, aligning with other potential factors that may influence the detailed design (e.g. avoiding archaeological resource). It is confirmed that the Applicant will comply with DMRB Chapter CD622[8], and other relevant requirements for any proposed directional drilling under the NH network. As noted in the response, the NH protective provisions will secure these approvals and requirements. With regards to consideration of the potential impact of drilling upon other SRN assets, such as drainage, it should be noted that a full clash detection exercise would be procured at the detailed design stage, when the design detail for the Proposed Development is more precise. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1) notes: *"To identify any existing infrastructure constraints, both consultation and a desk-based study will be undertaken prior to construction so that appropriate mitigation such as buffers can be incorporated into the design. Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) scans will also be used by Contractors to check for buried utilities prior to earth breaking site activities. The Applicant will endeavour to engage with utilities providers as appropriate."* The clash detection exercise would be undertaken at the earliest appropriate opportunity during the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development and any NH assets identified would be appropriately avoided by design. Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

[8] National Highways (2025) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD622 Managing Geotechnical Risk Version 2.0.0

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		SRN assets, such as drainage for our review. Additional asset impact may require further approval processes. National Highways protective provisions secures these approvals and requirements. All Cable Works will require monitoring and assurance, with safety risks assessed for monitoring and survey works within the proximity of the A46 live carriageway. *Works No 9* *Works to create, enhance and maintain green infrastructure and environmental mitigation including landscape and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement areas; habitat creation and management, including earthworks, landscaping, means of enclosure, and the laying and construction of drainage infrastructure; the laying down of permissive paths, signage and information boards; improvements to existing and laying down of new or diverted public rights of way or permissive paths, signage and information boards; and screening*	
	3	*Drainage* The Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy **[APP-147]** states the Principal Site proposes to occupy agricultural land with no known positive drainage system. Currently rainfall is either absorbed into the ground (ground testing suggests this is limited), ponds in low points or flows overland to existing watercourses. Chapter 4 explains the proposed drainage strategy including methods to mimic the current greenfield drainage arrangements. However, swales will be constructed around the perimeter of the solar PV fields and compounds with capacity for 1 in 100 year + 40% climate change events. Water contained within the swales will either evaporate, infiltrate the ground or be discharged at a controlled rate into adjacent watercourses. Drainage proposals are of particular interest to National Highways to ensure that surface water run-off from the site does not threaten the integrity of National Highways drainage assets. As set out in Paragraph 59 of DfT Circular 01/2022, National Highways will not accept any additional water run-off arising from any change of use into our highway drainage systems, or any new connections into those systems from third party development drainage systems. *Paragraph 59 DfT Circular 01/2022* *To ensure the integrity of the highway drainage systems, no new connections into those systems from third party development and proposed drainage schemes will be accepted. Where there is already an existing informal or formal connection into the highway drainage system from a proposed development site, the right for a connection may be allowed to continue provided that the flow, rate and quality of the discharge into the highway drainage system remains unaltered or results in a betterment. The company may require a drainage management and maintenance agreement to be entered into to secure this requirement in perpetuity.* If the proposed swales within the Applicant's site outfall into the NH drainage system, this will require careful policy consideration and formal management and maintenance agreement with NH in accordance with paragraph 59 of the DfT Circular 01/2022. A management and maintenance agreement may be required to ensure that the proposed maintenance arrangements for the swales are followed accordingly and do not adversely affect the efficiency or operation of the SRN drainage system.	Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS of the ES **[APP-147]** sets out the approach to surface water management. Surface water runoff will be collected and drained to surface water bodies, either to watercourses, or in certain cases, to ground where a watercourse is not present in the vicinity. No surface water drainage will be discharged to National Highway infrastructure during the operation of the Proposed Development. The only potential pathway of discharge to any highway infrastructure would be during the construction and decommissioning works, if runoff cannot be drained on-site or to a watercourse. However, given that access to the Order Limits will not be via the SRN, there would be no potential mechanism for drainage to National Highways' infrastructure during these phases of the Proposed Development. Regarding maintenance, the Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** (ref. paragraph 4.13.1) notes that the proposed SWDS will be maintained by the Applicant, or another private operator to be confirmed. The provision of a detailed SWDS, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework SWDS, is secured under Requirement 10 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, with all proposed drainage features maintained according to standard practice. As such, the Applicant does not consider there are any requirements for National Highways to be included as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 10(1) (Surface and foul water drainage) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		Additionally, if the swales do not outfall into the NH drainage system, we still expect that NH will be consulted on surface water drainage scheme and (if any) foul water drainage system for the Application site. Given the swales close proximity to the SRN, it is essential that they are properly maintained to ensure their efficient operation and to avoid any potential flood risk to the SRN. To address National Highways concerns in relation to the points raised on drainage, we would expect to be consulted on the written details of the surface water drainage scheme and (if any) foul water drainage system required at schedule 2 requirement 10. We would also seek to secure a requirement that no part of the authorised development is carried out until an appropriate management and maintenance agreement has been entered into for reasons explained above. Please see our comments and suggested amendments in the table at paragraph 7.2 in this regard.	
	4	*Hedgerows* The Hedgerow Plan (APP-015) shows the existing hedgerows along the A46 will be unaffected by the proposed solar farm development except for hedge no. 265 along the A46 (see Fig 2.9 (sheet 4 of 16) Rev 02). Hedge no. 265 requires up to 7m of removal. However, it's unclear on the reasons why a section of Hedge no. 265 is required. Please can further detail be provided to National Highways for our review.	Removal of this 7m section of Hedge no.265 is potentially required to accommodate a fence around the Solar PV Array areas within Fields 30 and 31. It should be noted that this removal would not remove any hedgerow immediately adjoining the A46 (i.e. the hedge that runs parallel to the westbound carriageway of the A46) and instead would be the removal of this section of hedge running perpendicular to the A46, between Field 30 and 31. This is best illustrated on Figure 3-17: Maximum Vegetation Removal Plan of the ES **[AS-029]** (ref. Sheet 4).
	5	**Additional Interface** The Authorised Development will also interface with the SRN in the following way: <u>Glint and Glare</u> National Highways have identified a number of inconsistencies, typographical and formatting errors in the ES Appendix 14-D Glint and Glare Assessment (AS-092, AS-093, AS-094, AS-095 and AS-096) with the Applicant. The Applicant has provided a response to advise amendments have been made in this regard and an updated assessment will be provided in due course. *Landscape Mitigation for Glint and Glare* Landscape mitigation is proposed by the Applicant for areas which are likely to have a high or medium impact for glint and glare, or to screen views of the arrays and to reduce the magnitude of effect to low impacts in many locations. It is noted that this will also aid in further screening low impacts. Therefore, this element is required to achieve residual outcomes identified in the assessment. The proposals set out in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) appear to align with areas where new mitigation is identified as required within the glint and glare assessment. This will need to be reviewed / monitored on the run up to the construction phase and during to ensure that sufficient coverage is provided.	Additional Interface <u>Glint and Glare</u> With regards to the inconsistencies, typographical and formatting errors noted in the comment, the Applicant has updated these deliverables and shared with National Highways. These deliverables will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. *Landscape Mitigation for Glint and Glare* Road Receptors 13 – 16, located along the A46, were considered to have the potential to have High glint and glare impacts after the model run (Table 18 of Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]**). This model run assumes 100% sunlight and a bald-earth scenario (i.e. no vegetation or obstacles) so represents an absolute worst-case scenario, as per paragraph 4.42 of Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]**. Following the model run, a visibility assessment is conducted to determine the potential real-world impacts upon Road Receptors 13-16 (paragraph 6.195 and Appendix Q of Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]**). Google Earth imagery was used in the visibility assessment to understand the existing conditions (e.g. the level of vegetation/obstacles) and determine the likely real-world impacts, which at the time of preparing the report were slightly outdated (imagery from November 2021). Nevertheless, with consideration of this 2021 imagery, impacts at Road Receptors 13-16 were found to be None after hedgerow infill/allowing to be grown out (see paragraph 7.1 of Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]**), as set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, e.g. ref. paragraphs 4.1.20 and 5.2.3.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		Given that some of the receptor points assessed next to the A46 were noted as high without mitigation but lowered to none with mitigation, NH are unclear about the timeframe involved, particularly considering the time it takes for new planting to become established. Hedgerows, which are intended to be maintained at 2–3 metres to achieve mitigation, will take several years to reach effective height and density. Additionally, as all the proposed planting is deciduous, it is important to confirm whether the winter period has been taken into account. Questions also remain about whether the existing hedge, which is to have individual trees planted into it, is already high enough, and whether gaps created during planting have been considered in the assessment. Given these factors, it is important to understand at what point the mitigation measures will be considered fully functional and what provisions will be in place in the interim. A five-year period may not be sufficient for the vegetation to mature to an effective level, and no longer-term provisions, particularly regarding inspection and maintenance, have been noted. NH want to be clear that the individual trees planted within the redline boundary shown in the LEMP will remain the responsibility of Fosse Green Solar Farm, and that NH will not assume any liability for their maintenance. It is also expected that these trees will be managed in accordance with the Section 141 of the Highways Act, which requires the Applicant not to plant within 15 feet from the centre of a made-up carriageway particularly regarding trees that may affect the highway. Reference should be made to the new standard LD117 Landscape Design (available at standardsforhighways.co.uk) concerning appropriate tree size in relation to proximity to the roadside. Furthermore, Black Poplar is not a recommended species for planting adjacent to the road, especially in this area, and there was no indication provided of the specific species proposed for planting next to the A46. In relation to the LEMP at this stage, NH seek further clarity on: a) what temporary screening will be provided as, i.e. if there are alternate or additional proposals to provide screening if temporary landscape is not sufficient during the construction period plus the post-construction period of 5 years. b) The landscape proposals include monitoring of new landscape, but it is not clear how the management plan accommodates new plantings, which may be required for permanent landscape. c) Establishment maintenance includes a provision to establish and maintain new hedgerow, trees, woodland and tree belts, as well as provide replacements for failed or defective plants during the next planting season. However, after the post-construction 5-year period is complete, there is only a stated requirement in the LEMP to remove dead or dying hedgerow. There needs to be a provision to provide replacement vegetation or temporary screening if removal of landscape elements leads to a state where insufficient screening is available. The Applicant has provided a response to the above a few days before this submission and NH are carrying out an updated assessment and comments will be provided in due course. We will update the Examination at the next deadline in this regard. To address NH's concerns relating to the LEMP outlined above, NH would expect to be consulted on the LEMP. Please see our comments in the table at paragraph 7.2 on requirement 8.	Since then, the images have been updated with a timestamp of June 2025. In the updated Google Earth images, the density and height of the hedgerows either side of the A46, which will screen views of the Proposed Development where glint and glare is possible, have increased, whereby these images show that the hedgerows have grown significantly along the A46 since the visibility assessment was conducted. Therefore, mitigation in the form of hedgerow infill is no longer considered needed along this section of the A46 to screen the potential glare impacts. As noted above, impacts at Road Receptors 13-16 were found to be None after hedgerow infill/allowing to be grown out (paragraph 7.1 of Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]**), and as such this conclusion remains valid, noting that the increase in hedgerow density has negated the need to infill/gap up the hedgerows along the A46 in order to establish this impact of None at Road Receptors 13-16. As outlined in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 5.3.14) and Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. GG-C1), hedgerows will be maintained between 3- 4m (a height that is at least equal to the upper edge of the panels), which will ensure the A46 is appropriately screened from the areas where there's potential for glare impacts to occur. Given the worst-case impacts occur during the months of April to October, there will not be seasonality issues with the vegetation. Overall, as the updated Google Earth imagery from June 2025 shows significantly dense hedgerows either side of the A46, and as such there will be no glare impacts upon the A46 given the existing hedgerows will sufficiently screen these impacts. Therefore, no additional measures are required to screen the potential glare impacts upon the A46. Regarding the planting within the Order Limits, this would be the responsibility of the operator with regards to maintenance, and not National Highways. The National Highways comments are noted regarding the management of trees in accordance with the Section 141 of the Highways Act 1980, the new standard LD117 Landscape Design, and the recommendation to avoid the planting of Black Poplar adjacent to the A46 – it should be noted that no tree planting is proposed in close vicinity of the A46 – refer to the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. However, the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** has been updated, and will be submitted to the Examination, to note the following: - At paragraph 5.3.32: "*Note, Black Poplar will not be planted adjacent to the A46*." - At paragraph 5.3.34: *"(e) any trees within the vicinity the A46 will be managed in accordance with the Section 141 of the Highways Act 1980 and the new standard LD117 Landscape Design (available at standardsforhighways.co.uk) as relevant"*. With regards to the requests for clarity in relation to the LEMP: a) No temporary screening is proposed within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, however the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** does propose 'temporary landscape measures' which include planting establishment/management principles for the screening planting (ref. Paragraphs 5.2.4, 5.3.22 and 5.3.23). The aim of establishment maintenance is to encourage thick, bushy growth, and includes monitoring requirements (ref. paragraphs 5.3.23(d-h)). The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** doesn't distinguish between screening required to mitigate visual effects and screening required to mitigate glint and glare. Note however that the existing hedgerows will be managed at a minimum height of 3m (ref. Paragraph 5.2.10), whilst proposed hedgerows will be planted and managed between 3-

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
			4m (ref. paragraph 5.3.14) for the lifetime of the project. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ID GG-C1) also notes that "*Native hedgerows will be planted/infilled and maintained to deliver a minimum height at least the same as the upper edge of the panels, which is currently proposed to be 3.5m*". These heights are sufficient to avoid a line of sight from the modelled receptors to the maximum upper edge of the proposed panels, which is 3.5m. b) New planting will be planted as part of the construction phase. In the unlikely event that screening planting fails, it will be replaced with like-for-like stock to ensure it performs as intended (and assessed). Refer to paragraphs 5.3.15 and 5.3.23(g) of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. As secured by the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, maintenance measures will be specified and implemented as part of the detailed LEMP, including (ref. paragraph 7.1.7) a post-construction monitoring programme (which will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP) comprising walkover surveys of the Order Limits undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.11) results from the post-construction monitoring will feed into the management plan and, if required, management may be amended accordingly based on this monitoring; for example, replacement planting and/or changes to planting species where planting has failed to establish. Given the measures set out above, and secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, the Applicant does not consider it to be necessary for National Highways to be included as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 8(1) (Landscape and ecological management plan) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	6	Traffic and Transport – Environmental Chapter 13 Based on our review, we are content with the information provided in ES Chapter 13 Traffic and Transport (APP-038) which address our traffic and transport comments raised in the PMIE document, June 2025. We are content that the proposed development will result in minimal traffic impact on the A46 during SRN peak hours. Additionally, we are content that the construction and decommissioning phases will have minimal impact on the A46, the nearest section of the SRN.	The Applicant acknowledges the comments provided by NH in regard to Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. The Applicant will continue to work collaboratively with NH in regard to traffic and transport related matters where there is a direct or indirect consideration to the SRN.
	7	Traffic and Transport – Framework Operation Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) We have reviewed the OEMP (APP-190) and are satisfied with the information provided. We note the following key points: (a) As a worst-case scenario, the proposed development will be serviced by a nominal number of staff (up to four permanent staff per day). In addition, there are expected to be around two visitors per week. (b) During the operational phase of the proposed development, site-wide equipment replacement activities are expected to generate a peak in the order of 40 two-way HGV movements per day and 40 two-way staff car trips per day. The OEMP notes these activities would be over a longer period (e.g. a number of months) and therefore are likely to be less. The applicant will submit a planned maintenance schedule for the year ahead to the relevant planning authorities.	The Applicant notes this comment. As stated in the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**, specific requirements and frequency of the monitoring will be confirmed in the detailed OEMP(s).

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
	8	Traffic and Transport – Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) We have reviewed the CTMP (APP-189) and are satisfied with most of the information provided. However, we note the key points below: (a) The construction phase is expected to be 24 months, commencing in 2031 and concluding in 2033 if multiple construction teams are mobilised simultaneously, or up to 30 months if it is built out sequentially. (b) Construction staff working hours are proposed as a 12-hour shift (07:00-19:00) Monday to Friday, and a 6-hour shift (07:00- 13:00) on Saturday. Staff are assumed to arrive between 07:00-08:00 and depart between 18:00-19:00, thereby avoiding the SRN peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00. (c) HGV and LGV trips are proposed to occur between 09:00 and 17:00. (d) The proposed HGV routing strategy utilises the A46 (SRN) and A15 to access the Principal Site and Cable Corridor, as shown in Figure 13-4 of the ES. (e) Table 3 indicates 0 two-way trips associated with the Principal Site during SRN peak hours. (f) Table 4 indicates 2 two-way trips associated with the Cable Corridor during the SRN peak hours. (g) Wheel washing facilities will be provided on site. (h) A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit will be conducted post-consent. (i) Section 7.1.5 states that trenchless methods will be utilised when installing the cable between the A46 to avoid any land or road closures along the SRN, which is welcomed by National Highways. National Highways requires further information from the Applicant on Works No 6, to be presented as a business case for review as stated above in section 4 (the proposed works). In addition National Highways has been unable to locate any reference to proposed signage on the SRN for the routing of construction vehicles. National Highways would expect such signage to be proposed to assist vehicles in utilising the A46 trunk road to access the Local Road Network (LRN) and reach the designated construction access points. This is in the interest of ensuring the safe and efficient operation of the SRN and protecting all road users. We want to avoid situations where HGVs stop unexpectedly on the carriageway due to missed junction exits and cause confusion to other road users. To address NH's concern in this regard NH would expect to be consulted and provide approval to the construction traffic management plan required at requirement 14 of the **Draft DCO**. Please see our comments in the table at paragraph 7.2 below in this regard. For any temporary traffic management signs installed on the A46, National Highways must review and approve the proposed signage. Therefore, full details including sign dimensions must be submitted for approval, such approval would be secured under National Highways protective provisions. All signage must be designed in accordance with the Department for Transport's requirements, as set out in the Traffic Signs Manual, Chapter 8, and must also comply with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). This is also set out within our protective provisions. As outline within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan Rev 2 (AS-102) and our protective provisions, A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) will be undertaken for any temporary	While signage is not explicitly mentioned in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**, signage will form a key part of the Temporary Traffic Management and will ensure that traffic utilises the designated routes. The Applicant will engage with NH (and LCC for local roads, as necessary) in developing the signage strategy as part of the detailed CTMP. This will include overall signage strategies for routes, including sign locations and sign face details for approval. While a WCHAR is not included in the DCO Application, it is considered that the requirements of a WCHAR report are sufficiently contained in the submitted Application documents. Points 1 and 2 of GG142[9] of the DMRB set out the aims of the WCHAR, as follows: *'The aims of carrying out a walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment are:* *1) to gain an appropriate understanding of all relevant existing facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians (users) in the local area;* *2) to provide background user information that can be referred to throughout the development of the highway scheme;'* These points are appropriately addressed in the Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP) **[APP-195]** (ref. Sections 2 and 3) and Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**(ref. Section 13.7), noting that the impacts of the Proposed Development will primarily be temporary (during the construction phase) and no permanent changes will be made to the pedestrian, cycle and horse-riding networks associated with the SRN. It is therefore proposed that an exemption certificate will be submitted prior to construction in this respect. In addition, the DMRB document GG142 states that WCHAR applies to "*all highway schemes on the motorway and all-purpose trunk road network*", however the Proposed Development is not itself a highway scheme, and therefore this requirement does not apply. Furthermore, the Applicant is not aware of any other energy NSIP, especially a solar NSIP, that has had a WCHAR for this reason. It is not expected that a WCHAR would add value to the determination process and the information required by GG142 is included in the ES and accompanying Appendix 13-E: Transport Assessment Note **[APP-167]**. The comment regarding other road projects is noted and the Applicant will work with NH (and LCC) with respect to the A46 Newark Bypass (and A46 Hykeham Relief Road) in the development of the detailed CTMP to coordinate the delivery of these projects. As noted below, the Applicant agrees to include National Highways as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 14 and will submit an updated Draft DCO **[APP-016]** to the Examination at the next available deadline. It should be noted that the potential cumulative impact of the Proposed Development in combination with these schemes was considered in the ES. As set out in Appendix 15-A: Long List of Cumulative Developments of the ES **[APP-177]**, the A46 Hykeham Relief Road scheme (ID95) was progressed to the cumulative schemes shortlist, and is considered in the cumulative assessment presented in Section 13.10 of Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. With regards to the Newark Bypass (ID100), as set out in Appendix 15-A: Long List of Cumulative Developments of the ES **[APP-177]**, there is limited potential for the construction phase to overlap with that of the Proposed Development (construction proposed to commence in 2031) even if there are minor delays to ID100, and there is no scope for operational cumulative effects. As such, this cumulative scheme was not

[9] National Highways (2019) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges GG142 Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		traffic management measures on the SRN that remain in place for longer than six months, in accordance with DMRB GG 119. Additionally, in line with this process, a Walking, Cycling, and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) will be required, or alternatively, an exception certificate must be provided. This is also provided for in National Highways protective provisions. It is stated within the CTMP that the proposed A46 North Hykeham Relief roundabout and A46 Newark Bypass are anticipated to be constructed in advance of the Proposed Development's peak construction phase year of 2032, and therefore will form part of the future highway network. These network upgrade schemes are not expected to overlap with the proposed construction phase of the Proposed Development which is anticipated to start at its earliest in 2031. However, as stated above A46 Newark Bypass has now been consented and timescales for delivery will not be available until March 2026. This further supports the request to be consulted and provide approval to the CTMP under requirement 14. Please see our comments at paragraph 7.2 below.	progressed to the short list for cumulative assessment within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**.
	9	<u>Abnormal Loads</u> NH understand the project will require abnormal loads for specific equipment and materials (elements such as transformers) to the site on the SRN. It should be noted that approval to move by road is not automatic. We implement a Water Preferred Policy which promotes use of water transport for the largest/heaviest abnormal loads (such as nearest suitable coastal ports, inland water/ rivers, beach landings). This is intended to keep the road usage to a minimum wherever possible to minimise disruption to other road users. Once a strategy for movement has been agreed, we issue what is called an 'Agreement in Principle'. This is in addition to any route feasibility work that we may agree to carry out. As stated within the Framework CTMP (APP-199), a specialised haulage service will be appointed to allow Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) to be transported, with the necessary escort, permits and traffic management in place. The Applicant will consult with the relevant highways authorities to ensure the correct permits are obtained. The police will also be given advanced notification under the Road Vehicle Authorisation of Special Types Order 2003. The Applicant has contacted NH through their transport consultant, Wynns Ltd, regarding AIL routes to the Navenby area . Agreement in Principle has been given to use the Port of Immingham via A15/A46 subject route suitability. This is for 139,000kgs transformers. Access via the River Trent berth at Staythorpe has currently been ruled out due to structural and negotiability issues. National Highways must be contacted 8–10 weeks prior to the planned movement, at which point the haulier should initiate contact. During this period, route suitability will be reassessed in coordination with all relevant structure owners and highway authorities. An application must then be submitted to National Highways, and if approved, the permit will be valid for six months. The Applicant should note that there remains a legal obligation to notify us of the exact date and time of each movement at least 5 days in advance.	It should be noted that abnormal loads have been assessed within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]** (with regards to 'Large Loads'). As noted in paragraph 13.7.61, all link and junction receptors were judged to have Negligible impacts for Large Loads with the exception of L8 (A46 west of Hykeham Roundabout), which was judged to have a Minor impact in this category. As noted in the comment by NH, abnormal vehicles are discussed in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**. As noted below, the Applicant agrees to include National Highways as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 14 (Construction traffic management plan). and will submit an updated version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** to the Examination at the next available deadline. As a result, NH will be a prescribed consultee in respect of the final CTMP, whereby the Applicant will continue to work collaboratively with NH in order to obtain the necessary approvals/permits for access to the Order Limits by abnormal loads.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
	10	**Compulsory Acquisition** 6.1 The Applicant's **Draft DCO** includes powers of the acquisition of rights in respect of the following land interests owned by NH as set out in the table below 6.2 The title of some of the plots of land in the table below (where this paragraph is referred to) are listed on the Land Registry in the name of National Highways Ltd however they form part of the subsoil to Fosse Lane. Lincolnshire County Council are the highway authority for Fosse Lane. As National Highways are not the highway authority for Fosse Lane we do not have any comments in relation to the permeant acquisitions of rights over these plots. 6.3 It is noted there are no proposals to permanently acquire the freehold interest of NH land. The proposal is to acquire rights over some of NH's plots. It is unclear whether the new rights can co-exist with the NH interests in the plots or whether NH's interests will be extinguished. NH require further understanding of how the acquired rights proposed by the Applicant will coexist with NH interests. If NH interests can co-exists with the rights proposed by the Applicant, NH can withdraw its concern in this regard however if NH interests are to be extinguished by the order NH would maintain its objection.	6.1 The land interest position is noted. 6.2 The Applicant notes that plots 2/8, 2/10, 2/11 (subsoil rights only) and 4/15 are not part of the SRN and that these plots sit within the local highway network for which Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) is the relevant highway authority. The Land Registry title documents which informed the Book of Reference indicate NH ownership (or part ownership) of these plots. The Applicant will engage with LCC to clarify the land ownership position and, if required, agree an appropriate level of protection for relevant parts of the local highway. 6.3 The Applicant believes that the new rights it is seeking to acquire in plots 2/7, 4/3, 4/5, 4/10 and 4/13 can co-exist with NH interests. Proposed directional drilling under the A46 will not affect the operation of the highway, however the exact location of the cable crossings will be discussed with NH at the detailed design stage in respect of feasibility and geotechnical risk. The Applicant will provide further details to NH as part of the feasibility study for Work No. 6 (referred to in section 2 above).

Plot	Owner	Acquisition Category	Works Proposed (Taken from the Applicant's statement of reasons)	Detriment to NH
2/7	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Cable rights- Works number 6 Interconnecting cables	Our comments at paragraph 6.3 of this representation apply to this plot. We understand Works no 6 effects this parcel of land which is subsoil to the A46. The nature and proposed scope of works remains unclear. NH require additional information about the works proposed in order to remove its objection for this plot.
2/8	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Access rights- Works number 8A and 8B 8A: Works to facilitate access	Our comments at paragraph 6.2 of this representation apply to this plot.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation				Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
				8B: Ancillary works to facilitate access		
		2/10	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Access rights- Works number 8A and 8B 8A: Works to facilitate access 8B: Ancillary works to facilitate access	Our comments at paragraph 6.2 of this representation apply to this plot.
		2/11	Lincolshireshire County Council and National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Access rights- Works number 8A and 8B 8A: Works to facilitate access 8B: Ancillary works to facilitate access	Our comments at paragraph 6.2 of this representation apply to this plot.
		4/3	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Cable rights- Works number 6 Interconnecting cables	Our comments at paragraph 6.3 of this representation apply to this plot. We understand Works no 6 effects this parcel of land which is subsoil to the A46. The nature and proposed scope of works remains unclear. NH require additional information about the works proposed in order to remove its objection for this plot.
		4/5	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Cable rights- Works number 6 Interconnecting cables	Our comments at paragraph 6.3 of this representation apply to this plot. We understand Works no 6 effects this parcel of land which is subsoil to the A46. The nature and proposed scope of works remains unclear. NH require additional information about the works proposed in order to remove its objection for this plot.
		4/10	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Cable rights- Works number 6 Interconnecting cables	Our comments at paragraph 6.3 of this representation apply to this plot. We understand Works no 6 effects this parcel of land which is subsoil to the A46. The nature and proposed scope of works remains unclear. NH require additional information about the works proposed in order to remove its objection for this plot.
		4/11	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Cable rights- Works number 6 Interconnecting cables	Our comments at paragraph 6.3 of this representation apply to this plot. We understand Works no 6 effects this parcel of land which is subsoil to the A46. The nature and proposed scope of works remains unclear. NH require additional information about the works proposed in order to remove its objection for this plot.
		4/13	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Cable rights- Works number 6 Interconnecting cables	Our comments at paragraph 6.3 of this representation apply to this plot. We understand Works no 6 effects this parcel of land which is subsoil to the A46. The nature and proposed scope of works remains unclear. NH require additional information about the works proposed in order to remove its objection for this plot.
		4/15	National Highways	Permanent acquisition of new rights	Access rights- Works number 8A and 8B 8A: Works to facilitate access	The title for this plot is listed in the name of National Highways Ltd however the plot forms part of the

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		<table><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>8B: Ancillary works to facilitate access</td><td>subsoil to Old Haddington Lane. Lincolnshire County Council are the highway authority for Old Haddington Lane. As National Highways are not the highway authority for Old Haddington Lane we do not have any comments in relation to the permanent acquisitions of new rights over this plot.</td></tr></table>	
	11	**Draft DCO** Discussions with the Applicant on the protective provisions are progressing well. Therefore, NH do not propose to detail the articles of concern in the Applicant's **Draft DCO** in this relevant representation as it is likely from the drafting that has been agreed so far, those concerns will be addressed in the protective provisions. NH expect to deliver positive news at the written representation deadline in relation to the protective provisions however if we have not finalised negotiations we will provide a full response of the articles of concern at the written representation deadline. However, NH do seek to raise the following comments on article 8 and the requirements at Schedule 2 of the Applicant's **Draft DCO**: <u>Article 8</u> (1) the Applicant may enter on so much of any of the streets specified in Schedule 4 (streets subject to street works) and may— (a) break up or open the street, or any sewer, drain or tunnel under it; (b) drill, tunnel or bore under the street; (c) place and keep apparatus under the street; (d) maintain, change the position of or remove apparatus under the street; (e) repair, replace or otherwise alter the surface or structure of the street or any culvert under the street; and (f) execute any works required for or incidental to any works referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (e). It is NH's understanding that all known street works should have been included in Schedule 4 given that there is not catch all provision under article 8. It is however noted that the works proposed to be carried out beneath the SRN (A46) shown on the Indicative Trenchless Crossing Locations document (APP-059) are not included within that schedule. Any works taking place under the SRN (such as tunnelling for a pipeline) are street works pursuant to the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA). Such works cannot take place without the street authority's approval. Section 51 of NRSWA provides: Prohibition of unauthorised street works. (1) It is an offence for a person other than the street authority— (a) to place apparatus in a street, or (b) to break up or open a street, or a sewer, drain or tunnel under it, or to tunnel or bore under a street, for the purpose of placing, inspecting, maintaining, adjusting, repairing, altering or renewing apparatus, or of changing the position of apparatus or removing it, otherwise than in pursuance of a statutory right or a street works licence. The word "in" is defined with the NRSWA under section 105 as follows: Minor Definitions in a context referring to works, apparatus or other property in a street or other place includes a reference to works, apparatus or other property under, over, across, along or upon it	The Applicant agrees that discussions regarding the Protective Provisions for National Highways are progressing well. In its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**, the Examining Authority set the expectation that bespoke PPs will be incorporated into the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** at or before the midpoint of the examination. The Applicant will include National Highways PPs in line with this expectation, unless the PPs are in an agreed form, and available for inclusion at an earlier point. The Applicant notes that National Highways will submit a written representation in relation to the Protective Provisions in the event that negotiations have not been finalised by the written representations deadline. Article 8 The Applicant agrees that the proposed crossing points under the A46 should be included in Schedule 4 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. However, as National Highways will appreciate, the exact crossing points have not yet been determined, and will not be until the detailed design stage, which will be undertaken post-consent. Therefore, the Applicant proposes inserting the following wording into Schedule 4 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** - "*those parts of the A46 that are within the limits of deviation of Work No. 6*" with the description of the street works being "*Street works to facilitate underground cable installation works for the length of the A46 shown in green patterned hatching on Sheet 4 of the streets, rights of way and access plans*". The Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]** have been updated to reflect these amendments and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		The definition of “in”, which is used to in section 51 NRSWA, makes it clear this would also apply to apparatus under the SRN. Whilst we note the Applicant is seeking to acquire rights over land beneath the SRN, given that the apparatus is beneath the highway surface powers under article 8 are also required to ensure an offence is not committed under section 51 NRSWA. Given the depth of the apparatus a 2 stage process is required; the need for both the street works authority under NRSWA and the land rights. To address National Highways concerns, we would request the Applicant updates Schedule 4 to include the crossing points on the A46.	
	12	Requirement 4 approved details and amendments to them (1) With respect to any documents, details or schemes which have been approved pursuant to any requirement (the “Approved Documents, Plans, Details or Schemes”), the undertaker may submit to the relevant planning authority and to National Highways where any amendments effect the strategic road network or land National Highways have an interest in for approval any amendments to any of the approved Documents, Plans, Details or Schemes and, following approval by the relevant planning authority, the relevant Approved Documents, Plans, Details or Schemes are to be taken to include the amendments as so approved pursuant to this paragraph. (2) Approval under sub-paragraph (1) for the amendments to any of the approved Documents, Plans, Details or Schemes must not be given except where it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the relevant planning authority and National Highways where the amendments effect the strategic road network or land National Highways have an interest in that the subject matter of the approval sought is unlikely to give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement. In addition to the approval of the Local Planning Authority, National Highways approval should be sought where any amendments to documents, details or schemes effect the SRN or land National Highways has an interest in. For any variations to the approved documents and plans, NH must ensure that changes do not adversely impact the SRN, namely the A46 Trunk Road. This is in the interest of maintaining the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH’s concern.	Requirement 4 approved details and amendments to them The Applicant proposes to include a new sub-paragraph to Requirement 4 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** as follows: *“(2) In determining whether to approve any amendments to any of the approved Documents, Plans, Details or Schemes, the relevant planning authority must re-consult all consultees that were required to be consulted on those Documents, Plans, Details or Schemes when those Documents, Plans, Details or Schemes were originally approved.”* The Draft DCO **[APP-016]** will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.
	13	Requirement 7 Battery Safety Management (1) Work No. 2 or Work No. 3 must not commence until a battery safety management plan has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. (2) The battery safety management plan must prescribe measures to facilitate safety during the construction, operation and decommissioning of Work No. 2 or Work No. 3 including the transportation of new, used and replacement battery cells both to and from the authorised development. (3) The battery safety management plan must be substantially in accordance with the framework battery safety management plan.	Requirement 7 Battery Safety Management The Applicant notes that during the oral submissions made by National Highways (NH) at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2), it was stated that upon further consideration NH no longer require to be consulted on the BSMP under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This is reflected in the Applicant's written summaries of oral submissions at ISH2 and NH indicated that this would be reflected in its Deadline 1 submission.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		(4) The relevant planning authority must consult with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and the Environment Agency and National Highways before determining an application for approval of the battery safety management plan. (5) The battery safety management plan must be implemented as approved. National Highways would expect to be consulted on the Battery Safety Management Plan. Fire and fumes could present a significant safety risk to users of the SRN given that the A46 shares a boundary with the application site. National Highways must ensure a thorough understanding and effective management of risks and potential disruptions to the SRN in emergencies. Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	
	14	Requirement 8 Landscape Ecological Management Plan (1) No part of the authorised development may commence, and no part of the permitted preliminary works for that part comprising vegetation removal, may start until a landscape and ecological management plan has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Lincolnshire County Council, Natural England and the Environment Agency and National Highways. (2) The landscape and ecological management plan must be substantially in accordance with the framework landscape and ecological management plan and for that part of the authorised development to which it relates must include details of how the plan proposals will contribute to the achievement of a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units for all of the authorised development during the operation of the authorised development based on the metric used to calculate those percentages specified in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report. (3) Each landscape and ecological management plan approved under sub-paragraph (1) must be implemented as approved and maintained throughout the operation of the relevant part of the authorised development to which each plan relates. National Highways would expect to be consulted on the landscape and ecological management plan. Required in the interest of the safe and efficient operation of the Trunk Road and to protect the soft estate of the Trunk Road from potential ecological or landscape-related impacts including glint & glare mitigation measures. Please see our comments at paragraph 5.3- 5.8 above. Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	Requirement 8 Landscape Ecological Management Plan Given the measures secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, as set out above, the Applicant does not consider it to be required for National Highways to be included as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 8(1) (Landscape and ecological management plan) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	15	Requirement 9 Fencing and other means of enclosure (1) No part of the authorised development may commence, and no part of the permitted preliminary works for that part comprising the provision of temporary means of enclosure, may begin until written details of all proposed temporary fences, walls or other means of enclosure, including those set out in the construction environmental management plan, for that part have	Requirement 9 Fencing and other means of enclosure The Applicant notes that during the oral submissions made by National Highways (NH) at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2), it was stated that upon further consideration NH no longer require to be consulted on the provision of fencing and other means of enclosure under Requirement 9 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This is reflected in the Applicant's written summaries of

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with National Highways. (2) No part of the authorised development may commence until written details of all permanent fences, walls or other means of enclosure for that part have been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with National Highways. (3) The details submitted under sub-paragraph (2) must be in accordance with the Proposed Development parameters and the design commitments. (4) Any construction site must remain securely fenced in accordance with the approved details under sub-paragraph (1) at all times during the construction of the authorised development. (5) Any temporary fencing must be removed on completion of the construction of the part of the authorised development for which it was used. (6) Any permanent fencing, walls or other means of enclosure for that part approved under subparagraph (2) must be completed prior to the date of final commissioning in respect of such part. (7) Any permanent fencing, walls or other means of enclosure must be properly maintained for the operational lifetime of the part of the authorised development to which it relates NH would expect to be consulted on the provision of temporary and permeant fences, walls and other means of enclosures. We understand fencing is proposed to secure the Solar site which shares a boundary to the A46. NH would want to review the details of the fencing proposed, the location and its potential impacts on the SRN. For example, NH would want to avoid the possibility of fencing being blown on the SRN. This is required for reasons of safety, liability, and maintenance in accordance with paragraph 57 of DfT Circular 01/2022: *For reasons of safety, liability and maintenance, any physical infrastructure that is necessary to mitigate the environmental effects of or on development must be located outside of the highway boundary of the SRN. In general terms, structures should be sited sufficiently far from the highway boundary of the SRN so that they cannot topple on to the SRN or undermine its geotechnical integrity. Alternatively, an appropriate structural assessment that accords with the DMRB must be provided. A Road Restraints Risk Assessment must also be carried out where any furniture, structures or other features would be sited adjacent to the SRN.* Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	oral submissions at ISH2 and NH indicated that this would be reflected in its Deadline 1 submission.
	16	<u>Requirement 10 Surface and foul water drainage</u> (1) No part of the authorised development may commence until written details of the surface water drainage scheme and (if any) foul water drainage system have been submitted to and approved by the lead local flood authority and the relevant planning authority in consultation with National Highways.	<u>Requirement 10 Surface and foul water drainage</u> As set out above, no surface water drainage will be discharged to National Highway infrastructure. As such, the Applicant does not consider it to be necessary for National Highways to be included as a consultee within Requirement 10 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		(2) The written details under sub-paragraph (1) must be substantially in accordance with the framework surface water drainage strategy. (3) Any scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) must be implemented as approved. (4) Where any scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) includes an outfall or connection into National Highways drainage infrastructure, no part of the authorised development may commence until the undertaker has entered into a management and maintenance agreement with National Highways. National Highways would seek to be consulted on the details of the surface water drainage scheme. This is to protect the integrity of the SRN drainage infrastructure, in accordance with DfT Circular 01/2022. It is currently unclear if a connection or outfall is proposed to NH's drainage network. If a connection is proposed this would need to be considered by NH and if agreed a maintenance and management agreement may be required. Please see our comments at paragraphs 4.7- 4.12. Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	
	17	Requirement 12 Construction Environmental Management Plan (1) No part of the authorised development may commence until a construction environmental management plan for that part has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority such approval to be in consultation with Lincolnshire County Council (as the local highway authority and waste planning authority), the Environment Agency and National Highways. (2) The construction environmental management plan must be substantially in accordance with the framework construction environmental management plan. (3) The construction of any part of the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved construction environmental management plan for that part. National Highways would expect to be consulted on the construction environment management plan. To mitigate environmental impacts during the construction phase and to ensure the SRN is not adversely affected by noise, dust, or other construction-related issues. National Highways shares a boundary with the application site. Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	Requirement 12 Construction Environmental Management Plan The Applicant agrees to include National Highways as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 12 and will submit a version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** to the Examination with this change at the next available deadline.
	18	Requirement 13 Operational Environmental Management Plan (1) Prior to the date of final commissioning for any part of the authorised development, an operational environmental management plan for that part must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority such approval to be in consultation with Lincolnshire County	Requirement 13 Operational Environmental Management Plan The Applicant agrees to include National Highways as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 13 and will submit a version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** to the Examination with this change at the next available deadline.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		Council (as the local highway authority and waste planning authority), the Environment Agency and National Highways. (2) The operational environmental management plan must be substantially in accordance with the framework operational environmental management plan. (3) The operation of any part of the authorised development must be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved operational environmental management plan for that part. National Highways would seek to be consulted on the operational environmental management plan. To manage long-term environmental risks associated with the site and ensure ongoing protection of the SRN. Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	
	19	Requirement 14 Construction Traffic Management Plan (1) No part of the authorised development may commence until a construction traffic management plan for that part has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority and National Highways. (2) The construction traffic management plan must be substantially in accordance with the framework construction traffic management plan. (3) The construction of any part of the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved construction traffic management plan for that part. National Highways would seek to approve the construction traffic management plan. To manage construction traffic and vehicle movements safely and efficiently, minimising disruption and potential hazards to the SRN. Additionally, as discussed in paragraph 1.2(b) above the Authorised Development will impact on NH's major capital projects including A46 Newark Bypass Project which received consent on 01 October 2025 by the Secretary of State. It is necessary for the protection of this project that the Applicant agrees to co-operate with NH in the delivery of the Authorised Development, in a way that safeguards the significant public investment that has been made by NH. Furthermore, as set out above, National Highways would expect to see signage on the SRN as part of the construction management plan. Please see our comments at paragraph 5.13 Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	Requirement 14 Construction Traffic Management Plan The Applicant agrees to include National Highways as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 14 and will submit a version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** to the Examination with this change at the next available deadline.
	20	Requirement 20 Decommissioning (1) Decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning.	Requirement 20 Decommissioning The Applicant agrees to include National Highways as a consultee within Schedule 2, Requirement 20 and will submit a version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** to the Examination with this change at the next available Examination deadline.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Highways Relevant Representation	Response to National Highways Relevant Representation
		(2) Prior to the commencement of any decommissioning works for any part of the authorised development, the undertaker must submit to the relevant planning authority for approval, in consultation with Lincolnshire County Council (in its capacity as the local highway authority and waste planning authority) and the Environment Agency and National Highways, a decommissioning environmental management plan for that part. (3) The decommissioning environmental management plan submitted and approved under subparagraph (2) must be substantially in accordance with the relevant part of the framework decommissioning environmental management plan. (4) No decommissioning works must be carried out until the relevant planning authority has approved the plan submitted in relation to such works. (5) The plan submitted and approved pursuant to sub-paragraph (2) must be implemented as approved for the works required to decommission that part of the authorised development. (6) This requirement is without prejudice to any other consents National Highways would seek to be consulted on the decommissioning environmental management plan. At present, limited information has been provided on the decommissioning phase of the project. The plan should include a transport assessment and construction environmental impacts to ensure that the decommissioning process will not adversely affect the SRN. This is particularly important where restoration to previous site use is proposed. National Highways must ensure the integrity of the SRN is protected. Inclusion of drafting in red would address NH's concern.	
	21	**Protective Provisions** As set out above, this project does have an impact on the strategic road network and to address National Highways concerns, NH does request that the Applicant includes National Highways protective provisions in the draft Order. Whilst protective provisions for NH's benefit have not been incorporated into the draft Order as part of the application, we understand from the Applicant there is an intention to do so. Discussions on the protective provisions with the Applicant are progressing well and we hope to be in a position to remove our concerns to the majority of the points above at written representation stage. However, if we are unable to deliver positive news at that stage, National Highways will provide a full response on its concerns regarding the articles of the DCO without the benefit of the protective provisions and full justification for the provisions. To date, NH has not entered into discussions with the Applicant regarding a Statement of Common Ground. However, discussions have taken place on the Potential Main Issues for Examination and comments given by National Highways in June 2025.	The Applicant will incorporate the National Highways Protective Provisions in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** at or before the midpoint of the examination, in line with the expectation set by the Examining Authority in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The Applicant has commenced discussions with National Highways regarding a SoCG, which includes the points raised by National Highways about protective provisions, and will continue these discussions to ensure that the final and signed SoCG with National Highways is available to be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.

2.8 National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)

Table 2-8: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) Relevant Representation	Response to National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) Relevant Representation
RR-200	1	**NGET's Statutory Duties** As a responsible statutory undertaker, NGET's primary concern is to meet its statutory obligations and to ensure that any development does not adversely affect those statutory obligations. NGET has a duty to protect its position in relation to apparatus and land which is within or in close proximity to the draft Order Limits. Additionally, NGET must protect its ability to deliver, operate and maintain its future proposed infrastructure. NGET will therefore require appropriate protection for retained or proposed infrastructure, including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus or proposed apparatus. NGET's rights of access to inspect, maintain, renew and repair such apparatus must be maintained at all times and access to inspect and maintain such apparatus must not be restricted. Further, where the Applicant intends to acquire land or rights, or interfere with any of NGET's interests in land or NGET's apparatus, NGET will require appropriate protection. Further discussion and agreement with the Applicant is required in relation to the impact on its apparatus and rights.	NGET's statutory duties are acknowledged. Appropriate protection for NGET's retained or proposed infrastructure will be included in bespoke protective provisions which the Applicant expects to incorporate in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** at or before the midpoint of the examination, in line with the expectation set by the Examining Authority in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
	2	**Existing and Future NGET Apparatus** NGET owns and operates the following assets located within and in close proximity to the Order Limits for the Project. These assets form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. The details of the electricity assets impacted are as follows: • 4ZM 400kV OHL Bicker Fen – Spalding North – West Burton Bicker Fen – Walpole – West Burton The following NGET New Infrastructure projects are known to interact with the Proposed Development: • New substation in the Navenby area NGET requests that all existing and future assets are given due consideration given their criticality to distribution of energy across the UK. NGET remains committed to working with the Applicant in a proactive manner, enabling both parties to deliver successful projects wherever reasonably possible however NGET must ensure adequate protection for its future projects both in terms of protection for future assets and future land and rights for the delivery of these projects.	Existing and Future NGET Apparatus The Applicant considers that the layout presented in the DCO Application represents a good design that has located infrastructure sensitively with good buffers from 4ZM 400kV OHL Bicker Fen – Spalding North – West Burton Bicker Fen – Walpole – West Burton. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** (ref. Section 3.9) explains the design principles that were developed at an early stage, and which provided a framework for evolution of the design of the Proposed Development. The design principles were informed by national and local planning policy as well as the outcomes of environmental assessments. Design details are secured within the design commitments and proposed development parameters. Under Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** the detailed design of the Proposed Development must accord with the design commitments and proposed development parameters. Cumulative effects and interactions between the Proposed Development and other solar Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) are assessed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. A full Planning Application and sufficient environmental information is not yet available for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby, and therefore a full cumulative effects assessment cannot be undertaken for this scheme at this time. However, in line with the EIA Screening Opinion (24/1080/EIASCR) an environmental impact assessment will be required as part of the planning application for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby, which will itself be required to consider the cumulative impacts of other applications in the vicinity, including the Proposed Development. Engagement between the Applicant for the Proposed Development and the applicants for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby has been undertaken and will continue as the Proposed Development progresses.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) Relevant Representation	Response to National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) Relevant Representation
	3	**Protection of NGET Assets** NGET will require Protective Provisions to be included within the draft Development Consent Order (the "Order") for the Project to ensure that assets existing at the time of construction of the Project are adequately protected and to ensure compliance with relevant safety standards. NGET also requires that the Protective Provisions include protection for any future assets. The Awel Y Mor DCO provides a precedent for the protection of future assets via Protective Provisions. NGET is liaising with the Applicant in relation to such Protective Provisions. Accordingly, NGET has not appended the version of the Protective Provisions it requires to be included in the Order to this Relevant Representation. However, NGET will submit these at Written Representation Stage, if not agreed between the parties by that point, with an explanation of any outstanding issues. NGET requests that the Applicant continues to engage with it in relation to how the Applicant's works pursuant to the Order (if made) will ensure protection for those proposed NGET assets, along with facilitating all future access and other rights as are necessary to allow NGET to properly discharge its statutory obligations. NGET will continue to liaise with the Applicant in this regard with a view to concluding matters as soon as possible during the DCO Examination and will keep the Examining Authority updated in relation to these discussions.	Negotiations between the Applicant and NGET regarding protective provisions are underway. As noted in section 2 above, the Applicant expects to incorporate these provisions in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** at or before the midpoint of the examination, in line with the expectation set by the Examining Authority in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
	N4	**Compulsory Acquisition Powers in respect of the Project** Where the Applicant seeks powers of compulsory acquisition over NGET land or land which includes NGET rights or apparatus, the Protective Provisions must require that the Applicant obtain NGET's consent to any compulsory acquisition of any such land or rights. NGET reserves the right to make further representations as part of the Examination process in relation to specific interactions with any NGET projects identified during the Examination process, and as negotiations continue, but in the meantime will continue to liaise with the Project with a view to reaching a satisfactory agreement during the Examination process and will keep the Examining Authority updated in relation to these discussions.	The Applicant confirms that when seeking to exercise powers of compulsory acquisition affecting NGET rights or apparatus, NGET's consent will be sought. This requirement will be included in the protective provisions. NGET's right to make further representations in respect of specific NGET projects identified during the Examination process is noted. The Applicant will continue negotiations with NGET to agree protective provisions, taking into account any such further NGET projects as they arise.

2.9 The Coal Authority (The Mining Remediation Authority)

Table 2-9: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: The Coal Authority (The Mining Remediation Authority)

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from The Coal Authority (The Mining Remediation Authority) Relevant Representation	Response to The Coal Authority (The Mining Remediation Authority) Relevant Representation
RR-278	1	The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas. Having reviewed the site to which this submission relates against the data we hold we can confirm that it is not located within the defined coalfield. On this basis we have no specific comments to make and there is no requirement for further consultation with us on this project.	This comment is noted by the Applicant.

2.10 National Grid Electricity Distribution

Table 2-10: Applicant's Responses to Statutory Consultees' Relevant Representations: National Grid Electricity Distribution

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from National Grid Electricity Distribution Relevant Representation	Response to National Grid Electricity Distribution Relevant Representation
RR-199	1	The application includes land in or upon which NGED may have assets and which may include (but are not limited to) high voltage electricity cables. NGED is currently reviewing the draft Order setting out the Authorised Development to establish the extent to which their apparatus and interests are affected. While NGED will continue to seek to have positive engagement with the applicant in relation to the project, NGED needs to ensure that the wider powers being sought in the Order will not have a detrimental impact on NGED's electricity network and its duties under the EA 1989. This includes ensuring acceptable terms of any proposed protective provisions. NGED is therefore making this representation as a holding objection to the application until an asset protection arrangement has been agreed between the parties. No formal agreement has yet been concluded and accordingly we are lodging this representation to protect NGED's position pending conclusion of an appropriate agreement. Once NGED is satisfied that its network is protected, we will notify the Planning Inspectorate promptly and withdraw the objection.	The Applicant acknowledges that NGED has various interests in respect of rights and apparatus within the Order Limits. The interests in terms of land plots that have been identified can be found within the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and can be identified on the Land Plans **[AS-104]**. The Applicant will continue to engage with the relevant estates team to ensure the Book of Reference and associated documents are accurate and up to date. The Applicant is currently negotiating bespoke protective provisions alongside an asset protection agreement (APA) with NGED. There his ongoing engagement between the parties on both these matters, and the Applicant is intending that these will be agreed and that the protection provisions can be included in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** at or before the midpoint of the examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The protective provisions protect the apparatus of NGED and specify that NGED retains its rights and powers over its apparatus, ensuring its access and maintenance capabilities are preserved. The protective provisions also seek to ensure cooperation between the parties in the interests of the safety and efficiency of NGED's undertaking. The Applicant believes that the provisions will provide a fair balance between protecting NGED's infrastructure and ensuring that NGED is not prevented from carrying out its duties under the EA 1989, while allowing the Applicant to proceed with the Proposed Development without risking significant delays or harm to any infrastructure.

3. Applicant's Responses to Local Authorities' Relevant Representations

3.1 North Kesteven District Council

Table 3-1: Applicant's Responses to Local Authorities' Relevant Representations: North Kesteven District Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
RR-210	1	**Examination Process** Whilst this RR relates to the Fosse Green Energy application, proposals for Springwell Solar Farm, Beacon Fen Energy Park and Leoda Solar Farm (all within North Kesteven) have been registered with the Planning Inspectorate and are at varying stages of the NSIP process. The Council has registered as an IP for Springwell Solar Farm and Beacon Fen Energy Park, taking part in the Examination process including attendance and making submissions on various matters; and will be doing the same for the Leoda Solar Farm if submitted and accepted for examination. The Council will welcome an approach for the timetabling of the Fosse Green Energy examination that enables it to carry out its duties in as effective and efficient manner as possible across all of these proposals. An unmanaged overlap of examination programmes might result in the Council experiencing significant resourcing issues to meet statutory deadlines whilst preparing for, and attending, hearings. The Council therefore requests that the Planning Inspectorate works closely with all relevant host authorities to ensure that it has the ability to engage effectively in the logistical approach to the examination of all these applications.	The Applicant notes the varying stages and concurrent progression of the Springwell Solar Farm and Beacon Fen Energy Park Schemes, and acknowledges the level of resource North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) is dedicating to participating in those Examinations (and the same for Leoda Solar Farm if submitted and accepted for examination). The Applicant welcomes NKDC's request for the Planning Inspectorate to consider timetabling that avoids unmanaged overlap between Examinations and recognises the importance of ensuring that host authorities are able to engage effectively and meaningfully throughout the Examination process, which can be discussed at the Preliminary Meeting. The Examination for Springwell Solar Farm concluded in October 2025 and the Examination for Beacon Fen Energy Park is scheduled to conclude in February 2026. Leoda Solar Farm DCO Application is due to be submitted in Q3 of 2026 therefore it is unlikely that there would be substantial overlap between the Examination for the Proposed Development and these other Solar NSIPs. The Applicant remains committed to maintaining open dialogue with the Council as the Examination timetable is developed.
	2	**Duration** The operational lifespan sought for the development is 60 years, which is not typical. The start of construction to the completion of decommissioning is likely to span a period in excess of 64 years. It is not entirely clear that the long duration of the development has been properly justified and in all cases factored into the assessments of its impacts. In this regard paragraphs 2.10.150 and 2.10.151 of National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) will be relevant. The Council will expand on this matter in its Local Impact Report and Written Representation.	Paragraph 2.10.150 of NPS EN-3 states that *"The time limited nature of the solar farm, where a time limit is sought as a condition of consent, is likely to be an important consideration for the Secretary of State"*. It should be noted that the non-permanent and reversible nature of a solar NSIP with 60 year consent has also been acknowledged in the Secretary of State's decisions on a number of solar NSIPs, such as Tillbridge Solar Farm, Mallard Pass Solar Project, West Burton and Gate Burton Energy Parks, which have all been granted consent. NPS EN-3 also supports this position at paragraph 2.10.66 which states that: "*time limited consent, where granted, is described as temporary because there is a finite period for which it exists, after which the project would cease to have consent and therefore must seek to extend the period of consent or be decommissioned and removed*." The lifespan of 60 years has been identified as being a suitable period during which the Proposed Development can provide energy to the national grid. Under Requirement 20 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational period the land would be available for its current use. Any material change of use would require planning permission. It is noted that paragraph 2.10.151 of NPS EN-3 sets out that *"The Secretary of State should consider the period of time the applicant is seeking to operate the generating station, as well as the extent to which the site will return to its original state, when assessing impacts such as landscape and visual effects and potential effects on the settings of heritage assets and nationally designated landscapes".* Accordingly, each assessment presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) has appropriately and robustly considered the duration of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development – the assessment scenarios (including the duration of phases of the Proposed Development) that are being considered for the purposes of the EIA are set out within paragraph 5.8.8 of Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**. The assumptions made with regards to the duration of phases of the Proposed Development are then discussed, as

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			relevant, within the specific assessment methodologies of individual technical topics in the technical chapters of this ES (Chapters 6 to 14). Where assumptions around the durations of a given phase of the Proposed Development differ to that set out in Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**, this is clearly stated within the relevant technical chapter of the ES (Chapters 6 to 14), with justification as to why an alternative assumption has been made. For example, where the duration of the construction phase affects the potential significance of effects, a robust worst-case assessment approach is adopted – this is noted in the technical chapters (Chapters 6 to 14) where relevant. The Applicant notes that the Council wishes to expand on this matter in its Local Impact Report and Written Representation and looks forward to receiving these in due course.
	3	**Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land** The Council has commissioned specialist advice from Landscape (agricultural consultants) on the impacts of the solar farm on agricultural land in a shared arrangement with Lincolnshire County Council. That advice has informed these comments. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 is the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy. This states that applicants for energy developments should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a); preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5); and not site development on BMV without justification. NPS EN-3 for Renewable Energy includes a section specifically for solar voltaic generation. This states that applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed, brownfield, contaminated and industrial land; and where the use of agricultural land is found necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred, avoiding the use of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land where possible. Whilst it is recognised that such development will likely use some agricultural land, and is not prohibited on BMV, applicants should explain their choice of site. This approach was reinforced by the Written Ministerial Statement on solar infrastructure (15 May 2024), increasing the onus placed on developers to show that the use of higher quality land is necessary. The Written Ministerial Statement also recognised the geographical clustering of proposed solar developments in some rural areas, highlighting Lincolnshire as a specific example; and notes that '… it is important to consider not just the impacts of individual proposals, but also whether there are cumulative impacts where several proposals come forward in the same locality'. In that context, and in line with Policy S67 'Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land' of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP), the Council wishes to ensure that, in attempting to meet the need for the development, the applicant has: fully explored the scope to utilise suitable previously developed, brownfield, contaminated and industrial land taken into account the economic and other benefits of BMV land sought to avoid the use of BMV land where possible by preferential use of lower quality land justified their use of BMV land sought to minimise impacts on BMV land, and on ongoing agricultural operations considered the cumulative impacts of other solar farm proposals in the area on agriculture demonstrated that the land can be restored to its former agricultural use once the development has been decommissioned.	The Applicant confirms that it has appropriately considered the items listed in Policy S67 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan in determining the location of the Proposed Development. With regards to exploring the scope to utilise non-agricultural land, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. As set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** (ref. paragraph 4.3.5), three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of these sites was large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres). The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Therefore, no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, 2 of the 3 sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site at Hawdin's Wood included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, however given the site has been developed for a range of uses, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, as detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that the use of brownfield land (alongside other locations for solar development), has an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar schemes, including on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		The Council are satisfied from the review undertaken to date that the Agricultural Land Classification report (ES Appendix 12-B) prepared by Roberts Environmental Ltd has followed a sound methodology, correctly identifying soils characteristics and the extent of different grades of land within its study area.	to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. As demonstrated above, these land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. However, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. With regards to economic and other benefits of BMV land, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** has considered this as part of the assessment undertaken, for example giving consideration to the existing jobs supported by the agricultural land. As noted in paragraph 12.7.52 of this chapter, it has been confirmed by all landowners that no job losses are expected as a result of the removal of agricultural land. It is expected that when the rent revenues from the land start, there will be additional jobs created on their farms offsite as landowners diversify their land further with the underlying financial stability of the rental income. With regards to seeking to avoid the use of BMV land and minimise impacts on BMV land (and ongoing agricultural operations), BMV agricultural land has been taken into account both in selecting the site for, and in the sensitive design of, the Proposed Development, in order to minimise the impact on BMV and agricultural operations. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.7.44), the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land due to the Proposed Development would not be permanent. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operational life, the land will be returned to the current owners and available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. With regards to consideration of the potential cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Development in combination with other solar farm proposals in the area, cumulative effects and interactions between the Proposed Development and other solar NSIPs are assessed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. The short list of cumulative developments, inclusive of the relevant solar proposals in the area, has been agreed with both NKDC and LCC. This agreed short list of cumulative developments is provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.10.15) estimates for the County of Lincolnshire, derived for previous NSIPs in Lincolnshire, estimate the proportion of BMV land to be in the order of 71%, based on extrapolation from available mapping. It is estimated that the solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire, together with the Proposed Development, account for approximately 1.4% of the BMV land in the County. Whilst there is a degree of uncertainty around this proportion it is indicative that the solar NSIPs represent a small proportion of BMV land in the County. The assessment concludes that the cumulative effect on agricultural land associated

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			with the Proposed Development remains not significant when considered at the County level (i.e. no greater than the effect of the Proposed Development in isolation). With regards to demonstrating that the land can be restored to its former agricultural use following decommissioning of the Proposed Development, the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** sets out measures to be taken to ensure that the soil is protected and is able to revert back to its former condition. This includes the maintenance of soils (ref. section 6.9) and the implementation of a monitoring schedule to be undertaken and set out within the detailed SMP. Decommissioning of the Proposed Development and restoration/reinstatement of the land back to its former condition after 60 years is required and secured via Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	4	Chapter 12 of the ES predicts that the impact of the proposals on agricultural land use will be as follows: **The Principal Site**: Table 12-15 identifies that the Principal Site covers 1,018.7 ha of land, of which 985.3 ha (94%) is in agricultural use. Some 282.9 ha (27.8% of the Principal Site) falls within Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade 3a, and so is classed as BMV. The other agricultural land (702.4 ha, 68.9% of the Principal Site) falls within Grade 3b, and so is classed as moderate quality, non-BMV land. The remaining 33.4ha of land (3.3% of the Principal Site) was either in non-agricultural use (15.0ha) or was not surveyed (18.4ha). The area proposed to be under solar arrays for the lifespan of the development is estimated at 456ha. As well as the solar panel arrays and 'solar stations' themselves, parts of the Principal Site will be used for built development, including access tracks and roads, construction compounds, BESS, and substation. The ES has taken a reasonable and precautionary approach by assessing the impacts on the basis that all of this land will be unavailable for its current arable cropping use for the duration of the construction and operational phases of the development. The application suggests that the only permanent loss of agricultural land will be 4.6ha which are to be used for planting and habitat creation, of which some 1.5ha would be BMV. This assumes that all of the remaining areas - including hardstandings, tracks, solar stations, the BESS and substation – would be restored to a condition whereby they would regain their original ALC grade, including those areas of BMV. **Cable Corridor**: this overlaps with 53ha of the Principal Site, but comprises an additional 298ha of agricultural land. This land has not been surveyed in detail. Only a limited portion of the corridor would be used for cable installation, with the application suggesting that soils would be reinstated at the end of the construction period, allowing the land to recover its original ALC grade. Nevertheless, it is noted that provisional ALC data mapping indicates that there may be some areas of Grade 2 land within the corridor. The ES concludes that taking agricultural land within the Principal Site out of production for the duration of the construction and operational phases of the development represents a temporary minor adverse effect, and not significant; and this will be reversed following decommissioning. Indeed, the ES anticipates some potential beneficial effects on soil quality due to the land being "rested from intensive agricultural production". Permanent, post-decommissioning effects are	Regarding the Council's concern that it is not clear that the site selection and design approach have clearly demonstrated that it has not been possible to avoid impacts on BMV land, and how the Proposed Development has addressed the need to minimise impacts on BMV land, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to identify a suitable site that is as least environmentally constrained as possible. Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** sets out the methodology adopted for the site selection process. Following a formal application to National Grid for a connection into the 400kV Overhead Line at Whisby, National Grid informed the Applicant that this point of connection was not available and instead the Applicant was offered and subsequently secured a point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. Having secured land with willing landowners, and in recognition of the need to consider reasonable alternatives, the Applicant sought to assess the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints (including BMV consideration). Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** identifies four potential alternative sites including Scopwick Heath, which was discounted on the basis of it being largely located on BMV Grade 2 land, despite being close to the point of connection. Given the Proposed Development was not brought forward on the Scopwick Heath site and that the identified Order Limits does not contain any land designated as BMV Grade 1 or 2, the Applicant has demonstrated that impacts on BMV agricultural land have been minimised and BMV itself has been appropriately considered in the site selection process. The design of the Proposed Development has sought to minimise impacts upon BMV agricultural land as explained in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** which sets out the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. This has been achieved through the significant amount of retained arable land within the Order Limits (the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, which will be developed into a detailed LEMP (substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP) under Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). This retained arable land affords ecological and economic benefits associated with nesting birds habitat and retained jobs, but it should be noted that this retained arable land covers a significant proportion (approximately 116 ha) of subgrade 3a BMV land.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		also assessed as minor adverse and not significant, affecting a limited area of land. Effects on agricultural land within the Cable Corridor are assessed as not significant, as they will be reversed once the grid connection is brought into use. The impact on the operation of agricultural holdings is also considered to be low. Whilst the proposals have largely avoided the use of Grade 2 'very good' quality agricultural land specifically, they have not entirely avoided the use of BMV land. It is not clear to the Council that the site selection and design approach have clearly demonstrated that it has not been possible to avoid impacts on BMV land; nor how the scheme has addressed the need to minimise impacts on BMV land. The Council has identified some inconsistencies in the figures quoted for the areas of land affected and their agricultural quality. Also, the application involves retaining a high degree of flexibility on what form some parts of the development will take; the scale and nature of the physical works is not entirely clear; and the scheme may come forward (and be decommissioned) in a number of parts. The full area of land which will be sealed over – including by access road surfacing – is not entirely clear. The application places a high reliance on the removal of all the works, and restoration of the agricultural land to its original quality, including the BMV component. However, relatively little detail is provided on how this would take place, including for removal of piles, foundations, cables and hardstandings. The approach to assessing 'sealing over' (permanent as opposed to temporary loss) of BMV land has varied across the solar NSIP schemes within North Kesteven District; for example whether or not areas of green infrastructure/BNG delivery on BMV land comprises permanent sealing on the basis those areas would be retained for their landscaped/ecological function post-decommissioning even though no hardstanding is present. The Council's LIR will highlight this point further however we will be drawing the ExAs attention to the various approaches adopted in the context of the Fosse Green project. Return of the agricultural land to its original quality will also depend heavily on high standards of soil handling and management throughout all parts of the construction and decommissioning phases, which may be further complicated by each 'part' of the scheme coming forward and being decommissioned separately. There is limited information as to how benefits such as reductions in soil nitrate and phosphate levels will be maintained thereafter. Finally, these issues are potentially exacerbated by the proposed long duration of this 'temporary' development. The Council is likely to make submissions on these matters in its Local Impact Report and Written Representation.	Regarding the inconsistencies in the figures quoted for the areas of land affected and their agricultural quality noted by the Council, the Applicant acknowledges that there is a discrepancy in the area of BMV land reported within Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report **[APP-161]** and Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. As detailed within the Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report **[APP-161]** disclaimer found on page 3, this Report was produced in October 2024 based on a previous version of the Site boundary, and therefore figures may illustrate a Site boundary that differs to the Order Limits for which consent is being sought. The area of BMV land reported (and subsequently assessed) in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (i.e. 282.9ha) is correct, and as such this does not affect the findings and conclusions of the Report or the Environmental Statement chapters that rely on it. Regarding the Council's comment that relatively little detail is provided on how removal and decommissioning works would take place, including for removal of piles, foundations, cables and hardstandings, the assessments presented in the ES assume that the decommissioning works would be of a similar nature to the works during the construction phase (as set out in Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**, ref. paragraph 5.8.4), although potentially of shorter duration and lesser intensity. This is considered to be a robust assumption, whereby any further assumptions regarding the decommissioning works for the purpose of individual assessments are outlined within the respective technical ES chapters where relevant (Chapters 6 to 14). A detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, will be prepared and agreed with the relevant authorities at the appropriate time prior to the commencement of decommissioning works as secured under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This will set out the methodology of decommissioning works, which may differ to the approaches currently utilised owing to the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. With regards to how the assessment undertaken has considered 'sealing over' (permanent as opposed to temporary loss) of BMV land, such as where it is considered that habitat creation and ecological enhancements on BMV land comprise 'permanent loss' of BMV land, this is discussed in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. Paragraph 12.7.36 of this chapter discusses that the assessment assumes (on a worst-case basis) that the only permanent reduction in agricultural land will be for habitat creation given that the soil resource will likely be maintained outside of agricultural use once operation of the Proposed Development has ceased. However, it is noted (as stated within the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5) that following decommissioning the landowners would choose how the land (including areas of habitat and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement) are to be used and managed. The change in land use with regards to areas of planting and habitat creation introduced as part of the Proposed Development is likely to be beneficial to the soil resource but the low magnitude withdrawal of land from agricultural production is interpreted as a minor adverse effect, which is not significant, within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. Regarding the return of the agricultural land to its original quality, the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** sets out the high standards of soil handling and management measures to be implemented (to be further detailed within the detailed SMP) which will ensure that the soil is protected and is able to revert back to its former condition. This includes the maintenance of soils and the implementation of a monitoring schedule to be undertaken and set out within the detailed SMP (ref. Section 6.9 of the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**). It should be noted that regardless of the phase or element of construction and decommissioning works being undertaken, the works will

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			still need to adhere to the detailed management plans, which are required to be substantially in accordance with the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**, Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, as secured by Requirements 15, 12 and 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively). With regards to the Council's comment that agricultural land impacts are potentially exacerbated by the proposed operational lifespan of the Proposed Development, it should be noted that improvements in soil quality over time due to absence of intensive farming have been studied and reported. For example, research by Lancaster University[10] suggests that with good management (diverse planting, low-intensity grazing, minimal soil compaction), solar farms can boost soil-carbon storage over time. The Applicant notes that the Council wishes to expand on this matter in its Local Impact Report and Written Representation and looks forward to receiving these in due course.
	5	**Ecology** The Council's usual practice is to commission specialist advice from AECOM on the topic of ecology. However, on this occasion AECOM are engaged by the Applicant, so the Council is receiving advice from Lincolnshire County Council's ecologist. In addition, the Council has carried out its own assessment of the application's approach to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), together with advice from the Council's Tree Officer. The Council is broadly satisfied with the overall scope of the surveys and assessments reported in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation, which identifies a range of potential ecological effects during the construction of the proposal. These include permanent loss or change of habitats; temporary loss or damage to habitats; impacts on protected and priority species ranging from disturbance to direct mortality; and the potential for inadvertently encouraging the spread of invasive non-native species. During the operation and maintenance phase, the main potential effect is likely to be disturbance of protected and priority species. Decommissioning impacts are predicted to be similar to construction impacts, and include disturbance and temporary loss of habitats. There are no internationally important sites designated for biodiversity within 10km of the proposed Order Limits. The Council has no reason to disagree with the Applicant's Habitats Regulation Assessment, which concludes that there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of those sites as a result of the development. There are two nationally important sites designated for biodiversity within 5km of the Order Limits – Whisby Nature Park Local Nature Reserve (410m) and Swanholme Lakes Site of Special Scientific Interest and Local Nature Reserve. There are also 29 non-statutory sites within 2km of the Order Limits, including some within the site. When proposed mitigation measures are taken into account, no significant effects on these sites are predicted. In terms of cumulative impacts, particularly from the large number and area of solar energy proposals in the local area, there remains concern about the potential for adverse impacts on populations of ground nesting birds such as skylark.	The Applicant notes that NKDC are satisfied with the survey effort and assessments reported in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. The Applicant also notes that the Council has no comments regarding the conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment **[APP-181]** and the conclusions of no significant effects on other designated sites as reported in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. An assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on birds is presented in Table 8-14 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**, with Section 8.12 of Chapter 8 setting out specific mitigation requirements for ground nesting birds such as skylark. With these measures in place Table 8-16 of Chapter 8 concludes that no significant effects on ground-nesting birds (or other birds) will arise as a result of the Proposed Development. Specific habitat creation and management for ground-nesting, as well as other bird species, is set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** and secured via Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The extent and type of mitigation provided by the Proposed Development has been informed by the detailed ornithological surveys undertaken by the Applicant, as detailed in Appendix 8-G: Breeding Birds **[AS-086]** and Appendix 8-H: Non-breeding birds **[AS-087]** of the ES and summarised in Table 8-13 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. The mitigation provisions for ground-nesting birds consist of 64ha (158.1 acres) of permanent grassland and a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable. These areas are indicatively illustrated as Arable fields A to F on Figure 8-5: Bird Mitigation Land Allocation (Revision 2) of the ES **[AS-046]** but could be rotated within the areas of the Order Limits where there is no solar PV infrastructure, providing the principles for field sizes are achieved. The mitigation is secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is secured via Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP. Table 8-19 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation **[APP-033]** of the ES concludes that "*where cumulative developments are predicted to have adverse effects on the same ground-*

1. [10] Appropriate Management of Solar Farms Can Boost Soil Carbon Levels (2024) Lancaster University

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		The application also includes the following documents to guide mitigation and enhancement measures: Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) These framework documents will provide the basis for the production of detailed plans for each part of the development, influencing its detailed design, construction, operation and decommissioning, including ecological mitigation measures. The indicative scheme design and layout drawings show proposals for areas of retained arable grassland, bird mitigation (permanent grassland), tree and hedgerow planting – all to be managed sympathetically during the operational phase.	*nesting bird species as those present within the Order limits, e.g., Lapwing and Skylark, that appropriate mitigation measures are or will be included within the respective developments, to ensure there are no significant residual effects on the species, in adherence with legislation and policy. As such and given the extensive areas of undeveloped land within the Order limits along with targeted creation and management of habitat for ground-nesting birds, the Scheme adequately offsets the loss of arable farmland habitats and no significant cumulative effects on ground-nesting birds are predicted."*
	6	**Biodiversity Net Gain** Whilst the above are welcome measures, the Council has some serious concerns regarding the approach to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). At present, the Council is not satisfied that the currently BNG strategy is robust as some of the evidence is weak, and some of the assumptions seem unrealistic. These concerns include: <u>Establishing the baseline conditions</u> – there is a lack of clarity on the methodologies used; a failure to apply locally adopted strategic significance criteria; no confirmation that the baseline has considered any pre-application degradation; and an absence of condition assessment documents. The Council also requests that details of the ancient and veteran tree assessments are provided, to ensure that these are not overcounted in the baseline assessment. The Council notes that the submitted (revised) baseline assessment itself contains an automated error message ergo highlighting certain data omissions/inaccuracies. <u>Post-construction</u> – as above the submitted Metric contains an error for area habitat; there is a lack of clarity regarding potential footprint and shading effects of the tracker panel option; and uncertainty over the value of and proposals for arable field margins. As yet there is no clear commitment to management regimes to deliver BNG target conditions, which is usually provided in a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan, but which might be included in a revised FLEMP and future detailed LEMPs for each part of the development. <u>Phased development</u> – it is proposed that the development will proceed in parts, each with its own detailed LEMP. With this in mind the Council seeks a commitment that all non-panel related habitat creation measures will be completed at an early stage, and secured for the full 60 years of the proposed lifespan of the development. This will ensure that each part of the development has adequate BNG available whether or not that part comes forward at the outset. Should a particular part of the development not be implemented, such that the full suite of BNG areas is not required to meet agreed targets, then discussions could be held in anticipation of selling excess units at that time. <u>Monitoring and reporting</u> - The Council would also expect the proposals to set out monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the retained, created and/or enhanced habitats, with a	<u>Establishing the baseline conditions</u> The methodology is set out in detail within the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**, within Section 3.1.4 and the accompanying appendices. On this basis, the Applicant is unclear which aspects the Council believes lack clarity. The methodology is considered transparent and fully described. The assessment has been undertaken fully in accordance with BNG Statutory Guidance and the BNG Metric User Guide. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023), including its Policies Map, was used to identify local priorities. Additional justification is provided in Appendix E of the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**, demonstrating clear alignment with local policy. The Applicant would appreciate clarity as to what specific “failure” is considered to have occurred, and which adopted strategic significance criteria the Council believe have not been applied, given that no Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) is yet published. The Applicant’s approach detailed in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** remains fully compliant with government guidance for areas without an LNRS. The Applicant can confirm that no evidence of purposeful degradation has been identified. To avoid ambiguity, the following sentence will be added into the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**: “*No evidence of purposeful degradation of habitats since 30 January 2020 that has resulted in a loss of on-site biodiversity value was found.*” This revised version will be submitted to the Examining Authority at the next available examination deadline. The condition assessments have been clearly and accessibly set out within the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** itself. The ancient and veteran tree information is already included within both the report and the Metric. As these features are irreplaceable habitats, they generate no biodiversity units, and therefore, cannot be overcounted within the baseline under any circumstance. The concern raised does not reflect the way the Metric treats irreplaceable habitats. The automated message in the Metric relates solely to rounding behaviour, as explained in paragraph 2.9.1 of the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**. This is a known and expected outcome in large or complex sites with many habitat parcels. It does not indicate data omissions

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		commitment that the results will be submitted to the Council and Lincolnshire Environmental Records Centre in accordance with an agreed programme. This should be coupled with ongoing monitoring and quality assurance checks by the Council over at least the 30 year period from completion. Given site scale it is proposed the LPA would take a hybrid approach to QA checks adopting the landscape recover scheme methodologies of using AI habitat identification followed by 20% truth testing sampling. Total cost can be estimated once the metric has been adjusted to reflect the required changes and clarifications referred to above.	or inaccuracies, and it has negligible influence on the overall biodiversity unit calculations. This issue is routinely encountered in large BNG assessments and does not compromise the validity or robustness of the results. This 'error' is also mentioned in Appendix Table F of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide: '*These rounding errors do not impact the results of the calculation.'* <u>Post-construction</u> The 'error' message comment is addressed above. The automated message identified relates solely to rounding behaviour within the Metric and does not affect the validity or accuracy of the biodiversity unit calculations. The effects of infrastructure, including tracker panels, on habitat condition have been fully considered and reflected in the post-development condition scores assigned within the Metric associated with the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**. Shading, structural footprint, and potential limitations on ground flora establishment were explicitly taken into account during the assignment of post-development habitat conditions. This is consistent with established practice for solar schemes assessed using the BNG Metric. It is unclear what specific uncertainty the Council is referring to. Paragraph 3.3.4 of the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** explains arable field margin habitat will be lost, but the proposed Other Neutral Grassland habitat will deliver greater ecological value, improved species diversity, and a more robust contribution to the BNG uplift. The suggested alternative habitats provide comparable or enhanced ecological functions relative to arable margins and are fully captured within the post-development baseline. A BNG Assessment Report is not the mechanism through which detailed prescriptions for long-term management are provided. Such detail is provided through the LEMP at the appropriate stage. The relevant commitment made at this stage is the delivery of the BNG targets themselves. With regards to the reference of a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP), the purpose of an HMMP would be to outline how the land will be managed over at least 30 years to create and enhance habitats for BNG, and to manage and monitor the BNG. The Applicant considers that a specific HMMP is not required given the commitments made within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, secured by the DCO, which includes detail on the relevant management/monitoring regimes to deliver BNG targets that will be implemented as part of the detailed LEMP. The following is secured within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.7) which will be carried through into the detailed LEMP: "*A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP. Walkover surveys of the DCO Site will be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. This monitoring will also be used for the purposes of BNG Condition Assessments that requires a 30-year management plan*." The detailed LEMP will contain the information that a HMMP is designed to provide, and therefore, an additional document is not required. <u>Phased development</u> It should be noted that the Applicant's commitment to BNG, as secured by Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, is not linked to specific phases of the Proposed Development – the minimum commitments made (i.e. delivery of a minimum of 30% biodiversity

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4)) are linked to the entire Proposed Development. The BNG committed to is based upon the improvement to the baseline habitats identified, and as such, regardless of the phased build out of the Proposed Development, the BNG commitment made ensures its delivery. To account for the phased build out of the Proposed Development, the BNG assessment presented in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** has assumed a two-year delay for habitat creation works across the site has been applied within the Metric as a worst-case assumption for assessment. In reality, the ecological enhancement/habitat creation would be delivered across the 24-30 month construction period, and as such the findings/conclusions of the BNG assessment under this worst-case assumption of delayed habitat creation, inherently shows that there would be 'adequate BNG available'. <u>Monitoring and reporting</u> A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan is not a statutory requirement under a DCO, however the detailed LEMP will include detail on the relevant management regimes to deliver BNG targets. As explained above, given the detailed LEMP will contain the information that a HMMP would provide, an additional document is not therefore required. For clarity, monitoring begins once habitat creation works (e.g., sowing/planting) have been completed, not simply post-construction of the solar infrastructure. The proposed long-term auditing programme, including AI habitat identification and 20% truth-testing, goes beyond what is normally expected for a DCO scheme and is not required for developments outside the mandatory BNG regime.
	7	**Arboriculture** The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA – ES Appendix 10H) is broad in scope, but unclear on the details of the protection plan(s) which will be implemented, perhaps because of the outline nature of the final designs. For instance, it will need to address the service and power cable routes through the site once final layout of the site has been arrived at. Similarly, the Council considers that the submitted Hedgerow Plan is comprehensive but the accuracy of the losses noted are dependent on the detailed design and finalised layout. The Council has concerns that the full extent of proposed removal/adverse impact and the need for mitigation planting has not been addressed. The Council has concerns that the potential adverse impact of Ash Die Back on ash trees – which make up 45% of the trees surveyed, and also likely a high percentage of surrounding green infrastructure – has been understated in the LVIA. This could result in significant loss of screening and amenity of the site over the proposed 60 year lifetime of the development. It is not clear that this loss has been taken into account of in the longer term provision of mitigation planting or that reasonable assumptions have been adopted in terms of the failure of existing green infrastructure over time. Areas of woodland felled may require root and stump removal. That may be detrimental to retained trees as there is a very high likelihood of intermeshed root systems. This should be addressed in the AIA and mitigation proposals.	It is noted that NKDC acknowledge the broad scope of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) **[APP-155]** and the outline nature of the design. An updated assessment of the final impacts of the Proposed Development (based on the final design) will be undertaken as part of an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan which is secured under the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** a detailed version of which is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and will be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP. This will take into account services and all other elements with the potential to negatively impact on trees. The submitted AIA report assumes a reasonable worst-case and takes into account working space requirements and other elements to deliver a realistic assessment of tree impacts based on available information. It should be noted that, given the reasonable worst-case nature of the assessment (the Rochdale Envelope approach) within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) **[APP-155]**, and the controls placed upon the detailed design via the various management plans (such as the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**) secured via Requirements of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, it is anticipated that the updated assessment based on the detailed design will not identify any new likely significant effects. The Applicant clarifies that ash trees make up 45% of *individual* trees surveyed (as noted in Plate 2 of the AIA Report **[APP-155]**); this does not reflect the proportion of ash trees included in hedgerows, groups or woodlands which cannot be reliably determined from BS5837 tree survey data. 417 of the 506 individual ash trees surveyed are recorded as being in fair or good physiological condition which indicates that the majority of ash trees are not currently negatively impacted by ash die back. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ARB-C1) notes: "*A pre-construction a check of ash trees within the DCO Site Boundary will be undertaken and trees*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		The proposed landscaping and planting principles appear to be acceptable, though lacking in detail at this stage. This includes hedgerow plant specifications, which will need to include details to ensure dense new growth rather than a single row of new plants. The section of the AIA on 'Ancient and Veteran Trees' should be supplemented with an annex containing details of the assessments demonstrating how classification of these have been arrived at. At present, and without that additional information, it appears to the Council that some specimens might not meet the classification for inclusion and this may then have resultant implications for BNG requirements (see also above). Proposed tree protection measures are broadly acceptable but there are areas of concern around upgraded access ways and use of cellweb. Attention should be given to potential increased loading on underling soils by construction traffic that may be far greater and more frequent than occasional farm traffic and therefore would require greater depth of cellweb or inclusion of such on some retained tracks. For instance, the access proposals near veteran tree 572 (which is also subject to a Tree Preservation Order) and other near trees indicate the formation of a wider track directly adjacent to main stems and potentially covering a high percentage of Root Protection Area, contrary to industry best practice guidance. It is advised where all new/upgraded access is required that the RPA incursion should be a maximum of 20% (or RPA radius of 15m for veteran trees), and there should be at least 0.5m clearance from main stem—this could be greater if trees are larger with pronounced root flare and larger surface roots. The Council also has some concerns around the wording of the **Draft DCO** in respect of trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders.	*removed where appropriate (e.g. where they pose an unacceptable risk to people or property). Trees will be monitored annually in summer during full leaf flush during the construction period where trees may pose a risk to infrastructure constructed as part of the Proposed Development. Ash trees showing late-stage symptoms of ash dieback may become embrittled, either due to degradation/dysfunction of the wood substrate from ash dieback or from secondary pathogens. The subsequent removal of trees in the late stages of ash dieback may become hazardous to contractors undertaking tree removal. Removal of ash trees prior to this stage is therefore recommended.*" With regards to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, this assumes that the monitoring and management measures, as secured by the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, are in place, including (ref. paragraph 7.1.7) a post-construction monitoring programme (which will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP) comprising walkover surveys of the Order Limits undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.11) results from the post-construction monitoring will feed into the management plan and, if required, management may be amended accordingly based on this monitoring; for example, replacement planting and/or changes to planting species where planting has failed to establish. As such, with these committed measures in place, it is not anticipated that there would be significant loss of screening as a result of green infrastructure failure. The methodology for tree removal and stump management will be detailed in the Arboricultural Method Statement secured via the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ARB-C1). In general stumps would be retained in situ where located within the Root Protection Area of a retained tree. With regards to the comment that the landscaping and planting principles are lacking in detail in this stage, it should be noted that the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** sets out the requirement for detailed specifications of planting to be developed as part of the detailed LEMP based upon the information set out within the Framework Plan. For example, (ref. paragraph 5.3.19) requires that a "*detailed specification for hedgerows will be developed based on the indicative species, sizes, and percentages outlined in Table 2*". The classification of ancient or veteran trees is subjective and as noted in section 5.3 of the AIA Report **[APP-155]** '*there is no universally accepted criteria to determine status'*. The Applicant's qualified and experienced arboriculturists identify potential veteran or ancient trees on site and these are then reviewed by a VETCert accredited (consulting level) arboriculturist. Key qualifying criteria would be a tree that is at least mature for the species and which features extensive deadwood or decayed wood habitat. Assessment draws on industry guidance, including that published by the Ancient Tree Forum and Woodland Trust to inform judgements on tree status. In the unlikely event that any veteran or ancient trees have been identified incorrectly, this would result in a negligible overall impact upon the BNG assessment baseline score. Furthermore, as the Proposed Development demonstrates significant BNG and commits to the delivery of a significant level of BNG (despite this not being a mandatory requirement for NSIPs), there would be no material impact upon the assessment undertaken. It is noted that proposed protection measures are broadly acceptable. In relation to the use of 3D cellular confinement systems to install new or reinforce existing access routes, the final specification for the surface would be developed to ensure that it is sufficiently load bearing and protects the underlying soil from compaction. Annex D 2.3 of the AIA Report **[APP-155]** provides

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			guidance on bulk density requirements for root growth. This would be further addressed in the Arboricultural Method Statement secured via the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. The track next to T572 is labelled as Moreton Lane on county series mapping (1888) which indicates its long-standing use. It is likely formed of hard standing compacted material which has been partially overgrown. The stated reference to BS5837:2012 section 7.4.2.3 refers to a maximum 20% of the currently *unsurfaced* Root Protection Area being subject to new permanent hard surfacing. As this access route is already surfaced this is not considered to be new surfacing but rather re-surfacing or reinforcement. For instances of new hard surfacing (not applicable to T572), this typically will occur on currently ploughed agricultural land and the installation of a loadbearing floating surface and the cessation of agricultural management (which typically results in root severance and soil nutrient impacts) will likely be a positive benefit to retained trees. The minimum 0.5m offset from the stem of retained trees will be achieved in the detailed design and this will be addressed in the Arboricultural Method Statement secured via the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** ref. ARB-C1). This access route near veteran tree 572 will be used for emergency access only and therefore is not considered likely to be subject to extensive use. The Applicant notes that there are outstanding concerns that NKDC intend to raise in relation to the Draft DCO in respect of Tree Preservation Orders and the Applicant awaits further details.
	8	**Landscape and Visual Impact** Lincolnshire County Council has commissioned specialist advice from AAH consultants on the impacts of the solar farm on landscape and visual impacts in a shared arrangement with the Council. Their initial comments are attached as Appendix A. A full review of the landscape and visual elements is currently being undertaken and will be included within the Council's LIR. The Council's consultant's initial comments on the submitted ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity (which together with Appendix 10- C Landscape Assessment and Appendix 10-F Visual Assessment forms the basis of the LVIA) can be summarised as follows: <u>Landscape Effects</u>: the development has the potential to transform the local landscape by altering its character on a large scale – also affecting the wider landscape character, at a regional or county scale - by replacing extensive areas of agricultural and rural land with solar development. This will affect the current openness, tranquillity and agricultural character, that are defining characteristics of the area. Significant adverse effects to the 'Principal Site' and 'Published Landscape Character Areas' are predicted at Construction (moderate to major adverse), Year 1 Operation (moderate to major adverse) and Year 15 Operation (moderate adverse). Significant residual landscape effects will remain, even after mitigation. Whilst it is acknowledged that new planting and habitat creation will be valuable assets within the context of the surrounding agricultural landscape, they are part of a large-scale solar development. <u>Visual Effects</u>: the scale and extent of the development would also lead to significant adverse effects on views from visual receptors, resulting in a changed to the views experienced of an agricultural or rural landscape to a landscape containing large scale solar development. Significant change to a variety of visual receptors is predicted at Construction (moderate to major adverse), Year 1 Operation (moderate to major adverse), and Year 15 Operation (moderate to major adverse). Significant residual visual effects will remain for sensitive users in close proximity to the development where it is not possible to sufficiently screen views of the development. The mitigation planting, if it establishes as predicted, will also go some way	Landscape and Visual Effects The Applicant notes that a full review of the landscape and visual elements of the Proposed Development will be provided within the Council's Local Impact Report in due course. <u>Landscape Effects</u> The effects on landscape and visual amenity are set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement **[APP-035]**. The assessment considers the impacts of the Proposed Development on landscape character areas at a national, regional, district, and local level, as well as the landscape character of the Order Limits itself. As stated in NKDC's relevant representation, the Proposed Development's landscape and visual assessment identified significant landscape effects on landscape character at a district, local and site level during construction and Year 1 of operation, but by Year 15 of operation, significant landscape effects would be limited to the landscape character of the Principal Site and the local landscape character areas that host the solar PV infrastructure, demonstrating the localised nature of landscape impacts. <u>Visual Effects</u> The Proposed Development design has been an iterative process, informed by a suite of technical studies to identify constraints and opportunities across the Order Limits, as discussed in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**. As a part of the design evolution, landscape and visual effects have been reduced by both embedded mitigation and sensitive design. For example, the Applicant has held discussions with the resident at Grange Cottage regarding concerns in relation to impacts on visual amenity from the proposed Solar PV Array within Field 46 (i.e. the field immediately south-east of Grage Cottage). It should be noted that Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[APP-035]**, which was supported by a series of photomontages within Figure 10-10 of the ES **[APP-098]** (VP35b in relation to the view from Grange Cottage), submitted with the DCO application identified potential significant adverse effects in Years 1 and 15 (Winter) of operation of the Proposed Development in relation to the potential visual impact of the Proposed Development.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		towards screening and integrating proposals in views. Any reduction in significant landscape and visual effects predominantly relies upon the successful establishment of the planting scheme. Cumulative Effects: the LVIA provides an assessment of the cumulative effects of the proposals with (each separately) other planned developments in the area. These includes the Springwell, Great North Road, One Earth and Leoda solar farms, as well as the North Hykeham Relief Road. Due to the extent and proximity of additional NSIP scale solar schemes in the area, the Council suggests that the Examination should also explore the potential for significant cumulative effects from these schemes in combination. The mass and scale of these projects combined has the potential to lead to adverse effects on published national, county and regional landscape character areas over an extensive area. This would also be an issue when experienced sequentially for visual receptors travelling through the landscape and experiencing multiple schemes across potentially several kilometres, albeit with gaps between some of the projects. Repeated views and presence of large scale solar would combine over time to create a greater perception of change. It is considered that, if built, these schemes combined would require the updating of published landscape character assessments to include large scale solar as a defining land use characteristic as well as agriculture. Management and Maintenance: through its LIR and WRs, the Council will examine the mitigation and maintenance measures contained in the Framework Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (FLEMP), ensuring these reflect the LVIA, and are properly co-ordinated with other framework plans such as the Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). The Council will seek to secure an appropriate period of landscape maintenance that ties into a period of time identified in the FLEMP and would expect an initial 15-year period of management and maintenance as a minimum. Control of Vegetation Removal: the Council will seek to ensure that clear vegetation removal processes are put in place to ensure that any vegetation loss is aligned with the **Draft DCO** and ES Appendix 10-H Arboricultural Impact Assessment, and any additional clearance is agreed with the relevant parties prior to being carried out. Residential Visual Amenity Assessment: The Council notes that the LVIA has assessed potential impacts on the visual amenity of residential properties; but concludes that following the construction phase, the number subject to significant (adverse) effects will drop by half, with no significant effects experienced by Operation Year 15 due to mitigation planting. The conclusions of the LVIA in this regard will be considered further as part of the Council's LIR.	As a result of these comments and ongoing discussions, the Applicant has amended the design of the Proposed Development to remove the Solar PV Array from Field 46. This is secured via the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, and other secured Plans, that have been updated and submitted to the Examination. It should be noted that, in light of this design change, the visual impact at Grange Cottage is reduced to not significant in Years 1 and 15 of operation of the Proposed Development, as set out in the updated version of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, supported by an updated set of photomontages within Figure 10-10 of the ES **[AS-119]**. Cumulative Effects The approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual effects is consistent with PINS Guidance on Cumulative Effects and follows a proportionate methodology as outlined in GLVIA3 {REF). The cumulative assessment contained in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[APP-035]** primarily focusses on the cumulative schemes within the 2km Zone of Influence (ZoI), as this was judged to be the geographic area across which landscape and visual effects were most likely to occur, although the nearest NSIP scale solar schemes beyond 2km were also scoped in given their similar scale and typology to the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These found that given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. It is therefore the Applicant's view that the previous examination reports further support the conclusion that significant cumulative effects on landscape and visual receptors resulting from the Proposed Development and other schemes beyond the 2km Zone of Influence are unlikely. Management and Maintenance Section 7 of the FLEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.11) secures the need to monitor and review the management prescriptions undertaken. This includes for walkover surveys of the Order Limits to be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. Control of Vegetation Removal The extent of vegetation removal is shown on the Maximum Vegetation Removal Plan provided at Figure 3-17 of the ES **[AS-029]**. This corresponds with the FLEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraphs 5.2.7 and 5.2.13) which commits to removing trees and hedgerows only where access is required and where using existing gaps in hedgerows or trees is not considered practical. The implementation of a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan which will outline the processes to be followed regarding vegetation removal and the parties this will be agreed with, requires approval under Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Residential Visual Amenity Assessment The Applicant acknowledges that the Council will consider the conclusions of the LVIA with regard to potential impacts on visual amenity of residential properties within its LIR and looks forward to receiving this in due course.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
	9	**Cultural Heritage** Archaeology: the Council has an arrangement with Lincolnshire County Council to use on the advice of the LCC Historic Environment (Infrastructure) Officer in respect of below-ground, archaeological heritage. The Council supports the views of the LCC Historic Environment (Infrastructure) Officer which are summarised below and contained at Appendix B. In summary, LCC continues to have concerns regarding the assessment work carried out to date, which lacks consistency and necessary detail. Some areas have not been subject to geophysical survey; and at the present time only limited information is available from the on-going programme of trial trenching. Additionally, the programme of trenching should be widened to explore areas where other techniques have not identified archaeological remains. Areas of habitat creation should be included in the evaluation work to avoid damage to surviving but previously unidentified archaeological remains. All of this information should be used to inform the detailed design of the proposals. This up-front approach is considered vital to address the potential adverse effects of wide-ranging impacts, including piling and foundation works, access improvements and hardstandings, earth moving, cut-fill operations, and vehicle traffic. LCC does not accept the applicant's conclusions that there will be no significant residual impacts on cultural heritage during the construction phase of the development; and that decommissioning is not expected to result in further impacts on buried archaeological remains. The mitigation measures proposed in the submitted Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan, the Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan and the Environmental Commitments Register are not considered to be adequate in this regard.	Archaeology. The Applicant acknowledges that a small proportion of the Order Limits which was not subject to geophysical survey, however the vast majority of those areas fall within areas of retained agricultural land or where ecological mitigation areas are proposed as part of the Proposed Development (the impacts of which have not yet been subject to detailed design but which are anticipated to be minimal at most). The Applicant is of the opinion that the assessment work completed as part of the ES (Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially **[APP-127]**, **[APP-129]**, **[APP-130]**, **[APP-132]** is proportionate and fully compliant with the policies of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, the NPPF and the EIA Regulations. Of particular note (within all of the relevant policies) is the need to understand the specific nature of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development (acknowledged in policy to be 'limited'); to undertake a 'proportionate' assessment of these effects; and to develop mitigation proposals to manage any residual effects. This assessment has been completed and suitable mitigation can be delivered. On the specific matter of the EIA Regulations, the potential for 'significant effects' has been adequately assessed. This assessment is presented in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** (Section 7.7 regarding construction impacts, Section 7.8 regarding additional mitigation and paragraph 7.9.2 summarising the residual effects). The strategy, extent and scope, and specific technical details of the assessment adopted has been agreed by Historic England (HE) and LCC at all stages; as can be seen in Appendix 7-H: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation of the ES **[APP-131]** which was approved by both HE and LCC. HE and LCC have been engaged in discussions with the on-going work, with LCC and HE attending site visits during the trial trenching work. A meeting on the subject of the completed trial trenching work was undertaken on 6 January 2026, where the positive and collaborative working between all parties continued. The final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**), is currently under preparation and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline and will enable a detailed consideration of the relevant data as part of the decision-making process. However, for the avoidance of doubt, the overall results conform to the summary presented in the interim report submitted with the DCO application **[APP-132]**, and whilst appropriate mitigation measures will be required, the final results do not materially alter the conclusions presented within Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** regarding the likely impacts of the Proposed Development and the suitability of the mitigation measures on the archaeological resource. The results of the final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**), is currently under preparation and to be submitted to the Examination at a future Examination deadline, and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. This Framework WSI will be finalised following completion of the Trial Trenching Report (to be submitted at a future Examination deadline), and will inform the decision-making process. As such, the Applicant is of the opinion that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the significance of archaeological remains and the potential impact of the Proposed Development, and measures to ensure appropriate and proportionate mitigation is included have been built into the process. The Applicant will be liaising with relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA) to develop the next stage of site-specific WSIs to guide detailed design and post-consent activities, and prior to the carrying out of any archaeological works.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			The Applicant acknowledges the comment regarding measures presented within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** however the Applicant would like to highlight that these are intended to be 'live' documents, updated and revised as appropriate, with detailed Management Plans to be prepared in due course to reflect detailed design. As such, the concerns raised will be addressed as part of the process post-consent.
	10	Above-ground Heritage Assets: the Council is disappointed at the lack of engagement with the Council from the Applicant with regards to the conservation provision within North Kesteven. Despite comments made at both the PEIR Review and Scoping opinion stages, no additional consultation has taken place. It should be noted that Table 7-3 of ES Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage lists a meeting on 2 November 2023, but the Council has no record of Officers attending. Despite previous comments that the study area should be extended to a distance of 5km from the Order Limits, this has remained at 1km for non-designated assets and 3km in the case of designated heritage assets. The Council is concerned that this may have resulted in a lack of proper consideration of the setting of some listed buildings, as the only asset assessed beyond the 3km limit is Lincoln Cathedral. Overall, the Council is satisfied that in most cases the indicative layouts for the solar arrays and mitigations have been positioned to limit potential adverse effects on above-ground heritage assets. However, the movement between settlements and the cumulative impacts, particularly on non-designated historic farmsteads, appears to have been given little or no consideration. Whilst the Council is generally content with the list of assets scoped into the assessment for further examination (table 7-9 in ES Chapter 7), Househam Wood Farm (a non-designated heritage asset) should be added and assessed. The Council also does not agree with the findings of the assessments of effects on the following assets: Morton Manor and Morton Grange – the assessment does not consider the movement in around the heritage assets, which also contributes to its setting. The approach towards the settlement of Morton from the A46 will be adversely affected by a solar array to the north-east of the road. This will change the currently open rural character and adversely impact on the setting of the listed buildings. River Farmhouse - the impact on the agricultural character and appearance of the farmhouse has been underplayed. The impact on the setting, including movement along Claypit Lane and views from within the site result in a medium level of impact, which will have a moderate effect. This considered to represent a medium-high level of less than substantial harm. Grange Cottage – the proposals will change the agricultural landscape in which the asset is appreciated. The impact will be a medium level of impact, which will have a moderate effect. This is considered to represent a medium level of less than substantial harm. It is considered that these assets should be the subject of further analysis in order to inform a bespoke mitigation strategy, rather than reliance on a blanket approach found in the embedded mitigation proposed.	Above-ground Heritage Assets The Applicant holds meeting minutes from 2 November 2023 within which the approach to trial trenching and the WSI was discussed. The changes to the Proposed Development following non-statutory consultation were also presented. The meeting minutes lists attendance from LCC and Heritage Lincolnshire, representing NKDC. These minutes can be issued upon request. With regard to the study areas for the assessment, the Applicant acknowledges there is a difference of opinion regarding suitable scope of assessment between the consultees. As clarified in the ES Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage **[APP-032]**, the approach to study areas was agreed through consultation with Historic England, who approved of the flexible, expertise based approach to setting matters at the Scoping stage, and this approach was further discussed and agreed in a meeting on 31 March 2025 between Historic England and Cotswold Archaeology (on behalf of the Applicant). As such, following Historic England advice, the flexible approach, based on expertise and not constrained by fixed radii, was utilised in the submission documents, and it is considered that this approach provides sufficient understanding of the cultural heritage resource and the potential impacts from the Proposed Development. The Applicant acknowledges the comment regarding mitigation being appropriate in most cases. With regard to the assets for which additional comments have been raised, the following responses are provided: • Regarding Housham Wood Farm, it is not a locally listed building, or a building recorded in the HER. The HER records Housham Wood Farm as a monument (farmstead, of post-medieval to modern date, HER ref. MLI86044). But whilst the HER record mentions the farmhouse as a surviving historic structure, research carried out as part of the assessment indicates this is not the case. Planning permission was granted by NKDC for the erection of a replacement dwelling (11/0629/FUL), with Conservation Officer comments at that stage not raising objections from the conservation perspective. The subsequent Application to discharge conditions (12/0052/DISCON) clearly illustrates the proposed and existing (to be demolished) buildings, with the aerial imagery from 2013 onwards showing the replacement dwelling within this farm. As such, the historic building on this farm had been demolished and replaced, and the replacement structure which dates to the 21st century does not comprise a heritage asset or require any further consideration in heritage terms. • Regarding Morton Manor and Morton Grange, the Applicant considers that the detailed settings assessment, carried out in line with Historic England guidance (the Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]**), provides an appropriate and proportionate level of assessment. It considered, and detailed, elements of the assets' setting which contribute to their significance, which includes elements such as views of the buildings from Morton Lane and the wider rural landscape. The A46 is not relevant to the setting of the asset due its distance from it and its status as a modern infrastructure development. This was not noted in the assessment, but it is neither feasible, nor proportionate, to mention all aspects of the landscape that are not relevant to the assessment. Views along Morton Lane were discussed, highlighting those which

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			contribute to the heritage significance of those assets, including the visibility of the Principal Site in those views. This assessment subsequently informed the assessment of impacts of the Proposed Development upon those assets, also presented within Appendix 7-D **[APP-127]**, and it was concluded that with the proposed mitigation measures, the appreciation and understanding of the special interest of the Listed Buildings would not be affected (resulting in no harm). • Regarding River Farmhouse, the assessment of level of harm upon the Listed Building, taking into consideration the asset's heritage significance and its setting, the Proposed Development and mitigation measures, was presented within the detailed settings assessment within the Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]**, in line with Historic England guidance. This focused on aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance (Historic England guidance clarifies that not all elements of setting contribute), and the Applicant is of the opinion that the assessment has accurately described the aspects of the setting of River Farmhouse which do contribute. These include, in summary, the gardens, associated farm range (and associated views), wider setting of agricultural land, and longer distance views in which the asset can be experienced (several views from the east have been highlighted, including from parts of Clay Pit Lane or footpaths). It should also be highlighted that those views which contribute have been taken into account, with no development between River Farm and Clay Pit Lane. However, any movement along Clay Pit Lane cannot be considered as contributing to the asset's significance, given the visibility of the Listed Building from the lane is obscured from many locations (and as such the farmhouse cannot be experienced in those views), and also as no such views (if they were possible more widely) form part of the conscious design (in contrast to, for instance, a drive approach through a parkland). In response to the assessment of impact, the Applicant would like to stress, as per Historic England guidance, that settings is not itself a heritage asset and as such the assessment of impact must be directed to any change to the significance of the heritage asset (not just the change to the setting). Here, the Proposed Development will change part of the asset's wider setting, but the historic and architectural interest of the Listed Building itself, and the contribution to the heritage significance from the asset's immediate setting, will not be affected at all. As such, although there will be a change within the wider setting, its overall effect on the significance of the asset will be minor (as only part of the asset's setting and experience will be affected), and the conclusion within the assessment therefore found the overall harm to be within the lower end of less than substantial harm. • Regarding Grange Cottage, the Applicant acknowledges the comment but is of the view that the Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]** provides an appropriate assessment of the harm to the heritage significance of the asset from the Proposed Development. In line with Historic England guidance, this considered how change within the setting of an asset affects the asset's significance (as the setting in itself is not an asset), and a slight change to the experience and perception of the asset within its rural setting resulting from the Proposed Development was deemed to fall within the lower end of less than substantial harm. Additional consultations with Historic England were held on 15 September 2025 during an in person meeting on site to discuss the layout of the Proposed Development in proximity to Grange Cottage. In response to Historic England concerns regarding the proximity of solar PV to Grange Cottage and heritage assets at Aubourn, the Proposed Development has been altered to remove panels from Field 46. The outcomes of these consultations is summarised within a SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England (which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**) and the changes

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			reflected within updated plans and photomontages, which have been submitted to the Examination as part of Change Request 1 **[AS-103]**. In summary, whilst the Applicant is of the opinion that the assessment of lower end of less than substantial harm is accurate, the proposed removal of the panels within Field 46 (as noted above) should ameliorate or resolve NKDC's concerns by reducing the change within the agricultural landscape surrounding the cottage. In relation to the comment regarding to embedded mitigation, the Proposed Development has been designed taking into account heritage constraints and informed by the staged assessment work completed to in order to remove or reduce potential impacts upon above ground heritage assets, and reflects a proactive approach to identifying, assessing and mitigating impacts. Additional, bespoke mitigation was not deemed necessary within Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, as feasible mitigation measures were included in the design of the Proposed Development (embedded mitigation) ensuring no significant effects upon built heritage assets would occur. However, it was clarified that appropriate measures will be implemented to ensure the embedded mitigation is appropriately managed throughout the duration of the Proposed Development (to include ensuring that the landscaping / planting measures included as part of the embedded mitigation will be managed appropriately).
	11	**BESS and Fire Safety** In light of the rapidly growing volume of BESS facilities across the country, it has been recognised that appropriate health and safety standards are required and in recent years, new guidance has been emerging. In April 2024, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero produced Health and Safety in Grid Scale Electrical Energy Storage Systems guidance which is applicable to this application. In addition, the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) has produced Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for Fire and Rescue Services in 2023. NFCC consulted on a draft revised version of this guidance in 2024, with publication of a final revisions in 2025, though this has not occurred to date. The submitted Framework states that a centralised BESS would be at least 790m from any off-site structure, which reduces to 200m for a decentralised BESS proposal. Although these separation distances would be in excess of the minimum recommended in the draft NFCC guidance, the Council seeks clarification on their accuracy, as some buildings appear to be closer to the centralised BESS compound shown on the Indicative Layout Plans. The Council has strong concerns about the potential risk to human health arising from fire related accidents at BESS developments. It is the Council's view that these issues, and matters of detail such as the safety advantages of different battery systems, should be considered through the Examination. In that regard the Council's view is that the 'perception of harm' to public amenity, safety and wellbeing associated with an incident at the BESS is capable of being a material planning consideration.	The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, developed in consultation with the LFRS, recognises the evolving nature of standards and guidance regarding, and as such notes (ref. paragraph 1.2.8) that the BESS will be designed in accordance with the UK and internationally recognised good practice guidance available at the time. In Section 5: Pre-construction Requirements of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, the key risk assessment tools to be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling at the detailed design stage are outlined. The Applicant can also confirm that at the detailed design stage, the selected BESS design will have completed Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) to fully inform inputs to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. The selected BESS, as mandated under NFPA 855 (2026 Revision), will have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) as part of UL 9540A tests and / or 3rd party full scale destruction testing. This testing involves burning the full BESS system to validate safe equipment spacing and performance test active and passive mitigation systems integrated into the BESS design. Through the described test program and detailed risk assessment tools the Applicant will demonstrate that the selected BESS design will not cause any significant offsite impacts to sensitive receptors if a BESS failure occurs. With regards to the request for clarification regarding the accuracy of plans, it should be noted that the indicative layout plans submitted with the DCO application are indicative at this stage, whereby the minimum separation distance between the BESS enclosures and Order Limits boundary will be finalised at the detailed design stage, but will be in line with the development parameters secured by the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** and Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**.
	12	**Other Matters** In its capacity as a District Council, NKDC will also comment on other local matters relating to noise and vibration, glint and glare, socio-economic issues, climate change and	Other Matters The Applicant acknowledges that NKDC will comment on other local matters relating to noise and vibration, socio-economics, climate change, decommissioning and the Applicant's

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		decommissioning. At this stage, these are considered to be important but potentially secondary to the principal matters outlined above, however, the Council will confirm its position through its LIR and WR. The Council will also make further comments on the applicant's assessment of cumulative impacts and on the potential combined impact of the development with other developments in the LIR and written representations. The Council is minded to defer to other statutory agencies on technical matters where they hold primary responsibility for providing advice such as highway safety, public rights of way, minerals and waste, fire safety, surface water, flooding and drainage. The Council also note that the applicant is still considering flexibility in the use of fixed and / or tracking solar panels (see for instance APP-028 ES Chapter 3: The Proposed Development paragraphs 3.2.9 and 3.3.8). Whilst each case is assessed on its merits we note that other solar DCO submissions in North Kesteven District have confirmed the use of fixed panels at the point of submission. The Fosse Green project differs in this regard and therefore the Council will highlight through its LIR any ES topic chapters where the potential use of either solar panel types might require further assessment, as well as any other implications of retaining this aspect of flexibility.	assessment of cumulative impacts / combined impact of the Proposed Development with other developments through its Local Impact Report and Written Representation. The Applicant acknowledges that NKDC defers to other statutory agencies on technical matters. As noted by NKDC, the DCO Application allows for the selection of either fixed south facing or single axis tracker arrangement panels. The Proposed Development and assessments presented in the ES (Chapters 6–14, **[APP-031 to APP-039]**) have appropriately assessed the worst-case scenario option to allow for the installation of fixed south facing or single axis tracker configurations. The Applicant notes that NKDC will highlight any further queries through its LIR.
	13	**Draft Development Consent Order/s106 Agreement** NKDC will provide detailed comments on the **Draft DCO** and wishes to participate in any Issue Specific Hearing in relation to the drafting of the DCO. At this stage, the key issues include the scope of the authorised development, the wording of the draft requirements, the procedure for the discharge of requirements and the proposed fee schedule. The Council has some concerns around the unrestricted powers around tree lopping and felling that would be afforded under Article 39. The Council is also likely to request an additional requirement to ensure commencement of the development is co-ordinated with proposals for the National Grid Substation at Navenby. Amendments to the draft Requirements in Schedule 2 are likely to be requested following the finalisation of the Council's LIR. The Council will be reviewing the draft fees and the number of days available for considering submissions/the period for the discharge of Requirements and further amendments, as set out in Schedule 15. The Council has recently introduced fee charging for BNG monitoring on planning applications. It will seek to ensure that an appropriate fee is set for monitoring BNG, ecology and landscape mitigation works in respect of Fosse Green Energy, as the responsibility for this duty is likely to fall upon the Council. In addition, consistent with its approach at Heckington Fen solar park (EN010123), Springwell Solar Farm (EN010149) and Beacon Fen Energy Park (EN010151) the Council will be seeking commitments to delivering a Skills and Education package which again we consider should engage a financial contribution. As these matters will require financial contributions, it will be necessary to secure them through a mechanism such as a s.106 agreement. At present it is noted that there is no draft s106 Agreement nor heads of terms submitted with the proposals. Finally, the Council and Lincolnshire County Council, suggest that setting up an Ecological Steering Group to manage the monitoring and mitigation of impacts arising not only from development proposals at Fosse Green solar park but other NSIPs within the District would be	The Applicant notes that the Council wishes to provide formal statements of impact on these matters in its Local Impact Report and Written Representations and looks forward to receiving these in due course. The Applicant remains committed to maintaining an open dialogue with the Council throughout as it has done to date. <u>Draft Development Consent Order</u> The Applicant notes the concerns regarding the scope of the authorised development, the wording of the draft requirements, the proposed fee schedule, and the powers to be afforded under Article 39 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** in relation to the lopping and felling of trees. As specific details of these concerns have not yet been provided, the Applicant cannot currently provide a substantive response, but will do so in due course, when further detail is provided. With regards to the suggestion of an additional requirement to ensure commencement of the Proposed Development is co-ordinated with proposals for the National Grid Substation at Navenby, the Applicant does not consider this necessary. As stated in the Grid Connection Statement **[APP-200]** the Applicant has secured a grid connection offer from National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO), to connect the Proposed Development to the National Grid's proposed substation near Navenby. The grid connection offer was received in September 2022 and accepted by the Applicant in November 2022 meaning that a connection bay has been allocated at the proposed Navenby substation for the Proposed Development. At the time of writing, the anticipated timeline provided for the Navenby Substation on NGET's website estimates that a planning application under the TCPA 1990 will be submitted to NKDC in early 2026 for permission to construct and operate the Navenby Substation. This anticipated timeline estimates that the application will be determined in Spring 2026 and, subject to approval, NGET indicated that construction is hoped to begin mid/late 2026. This timeline estimates that the completion date will be late 2029. The Applicant wishes to reiterate that this is the anticipated timeline set out by NGET at the time of writing, and the Applicant does not have information beyond that which is available in the public domain.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		beneficial to coordinate mitigation where this may have wider benefits across a number of infrastructure projects. The Council expect their views on the drafting and approvals process for DCO requirements, in particular, to be given significant weight in their role of ensuring that the impacts upon local environment and communities are minimised, and as an approving and enforcing authority, should the proposal be granted consent. In conclusion, these principal submissions are high level observations made by Council Officers under delegated authority, however, as the Council's formal statements of impact will be set out in our LIR and WR, the broad content of this Relevant Representation is made without prejudice. As the host authority and IP for the project, the Council will be taking a full and active role in the examination process and welcomes the opportunity to provide our views on matters of local importance.	This is around 3.5 years ahead of the connection date proposed for the Proposed Development and there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant as to why consent for the Navenby substation and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would be withheld. Given construction of the Proposed Development is anticipated to commence in 2031, to be operational in 2033, it is unlikely that there would be any overlap with construction of the proposed Navenby substation. Therefore, the Applicant does not feel that there is justification for the request to add a requirement to the DCO in order to co-ordinate the commencement of the development with the proposals for the National Grid Substation at Navenby. Additionally, the Applicant is not aware of any obvious reason why the proposed Navenby Substation would not receive planning permission and considers that such a requirement would potentially prevent the Proposed Development from being carried out efficiently. <u>BNG Monitoring / Skills and Education</u> The Applicant considers that a fee for monitoring BNG, ecology and landscape mitigation works is not required given the commitments made within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, secured by the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which includes detail on the relevant management/monitoring regimes to deliver BNG targets and monitor landscaping and ecological enhancements, which will be implemented as part of the detailed LEMP. The following is secured within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.7) which will be carried through into the detailed LEMP: "*A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP. Walkover surveys of the DCO Site will be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. This monitoring will also be used for the purposes of BNG Condition Assessments that requires a 30-year management plan*." Given this commitment, monitoring of the BNG, ecology and landscape mitigation works by the Council is not considered to be required. As noted below, the Ecological Steering Group referenced in paragraph 7.1.9 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** will oversee the monitoring and mitigation of impacts as relevant, whereby it is anticipated that the monitoring reports for surveys during operation would be sent to the host authorities and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for their information, along with a summary of any changes to management set out in the approved detailed LEMP. The role of the Ecological Steering Group will be set out in the detailed LEMP, whereby the relevant consultees would be given an opportunity to review the detailed LEMP before it is formally approved to discharge the Requirement. A Framework Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan (ESSCP) **[APP-197]** was submitted as part of the DCO Application. The overarching aim of this Plan is to make provision for the Proposed Development to create opportunities for the improvement and employment of local skills and engage in the ethical procurement of the supply chain. The framework plan categorises potential opportunities by three main themes: • Theme 1 – Development of Skills • Theme 2 – Access to Employment • Theme 3 – Supporting the Supply Chain Amongst other things, the Applicant will consider the following in the development of the full ESSCP: • A programme to promote apprenticeships during the construction phase;

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			• Interventions to support the training of employees and works on the Proposed Development; • Engagement with Local Authorities and Job Centre Plus; • Community and voluntary sector groups which specialise in local recruitment; • Awareness raising events to provide businesses with information on supply chain opportunities and the key capacity and capability requirements they would need to meet; and • Establishing relationships with relevant Chambers of Commerce and Federation for Small Businesses. Further information, including delivery and monitoring proposals, are set out in the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**. The Applicant has engaged with both NKDC and LCC in the development of the Framework ESSCP and will continue this engagement. A detailed ESSCP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP, is secured through Requirement 19 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and will be subject to approval by NKDC in consultation with LCC. As also concluded in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, there are no adverse socio-economic effects as a result of the Proposed Development that require mitigation to be provided. This includes in respect of employment, skills and the supply chain. The Applicant is not therefore proposing a contribution towards training as part of the DCO Application and nor is it required to do so. It is proposing a comprehensive Framework ESSCP to maximise the beneficial effects reported in the assessment which will arise from employment generation (including supply chain opportunities, and skills development), and Gross Value Added (GVA) generation during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. <u>Ecological Steering Group</u> The Applicant notes the suggestion of setting up an Ecological Steering Group and confirms that consideration has been given to the potential cumulative impacts of the various solar NSIPs proposed within the vicinity of the Proposed Development. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, secured by the DCO, includes the following commitment (ref. paragraph 7.1.9): "*Post-construction monitoring for flora, birds (breeding and non-breeding), riparian mammals, badgers and bats (bat box roosting and activity survey), will be undertaken in the respective seasons, in years 1, 3, 5, 10 and 15 postconstruction and thereafter every ten years from years 20 to 60. These surveys are likely to involve similar methods to those used to determine the ecological baseline of the Proposed Development and will be overseen by an Ecological Advisory Group or similar."* The Ecological Advisory Group (or similar) is considered by the Applicant to be the same as and fulfil the role of the suggested Ecological Steering Group noted in this response, overseeing the monitoring and mitigation of impacts as relevant. It is anticipated that the monitoring reports for surveys during operation would be sent to the host authorities and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for their information, along with a summary of any changes to management set out in the approved detailed LEMP. The role of the Ecological Steering Group will be set out in the detailed LEMP, whereby the relevant consultees would be given an opportunity to review the detailed LEMP before it is formally approved to discharge the Requirement. It should be noted that it is envisaged that the other NSIPs within the District would be required to also have an Ecological Steering Group/Ecological Advisory Group (or similar), who would also send monitoring reports as relevant to the host authorities and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for their information. Therefore, the host authorities will have oversight

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			of the mitigation proposed across all relevant schemes within the District, to allow for coordinated mitigation suggestions as part of their approval of the detailed LEMP(s).
	14	**Appendix A** AHH Consultants: Landscape and Visual Impact AAH Consultants, on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and North Kesteven District Council (NKDC), has reviewed the relevant Landscape and Visual elements of the Fosse Green Energy Application to provide initial comment to be incorporated within a Relevant Representation statement from LCC and NKDC. By reason of its mass and scale, we judge that the proposed development would lead to Significant Adverse effects upon the existing landscape and visual baseline, which is reflected within the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The development has the potential to transform the local landscape by altering the character on a large scale. This landscape change also has potential to affect wider landscape character, at a regional or county scale, by replacing large areas of agricultural or rural land with solar development, affecting the current openness, tranquillity and agricultural character, that are defining characteristics of the area. We are particularly concerned about the landscape character effects through changes to the land use over an extensive area of agricultural land, as identified in Section 10.7 of the LVIA chapter. The LVIA chapter identifies a "*change in land use and character due to the solar panels and associated equipment introducing structures within an arable landscape*". This should be considered in regards to affecting a vast area of land. Significant landscape effects are subsequently identified within the LVIA chapter with the identification of Significant adverse effects to the Principal Site (the area of the order limits covered by PV panels) and Published Landscape Character Areas, at Construction, Year 1 Operation and Year 15 Operation. Significant Residual landscape effects largely arise from character areas directly affected (where the development is located within these areas). The scale and extent of development would also lead to Significant Adverse effects on views from visual receptors, changing from views experienced within an agricultural or rural landscape to that of a landscape containing large scale solar development. The development has been identified in the LVIA chapter as resulting in a Significant change to a variety of visual receptors at Construction, Year 1 Operation and Year 15 Operation. Significant Residual visual effects largely arise from sensitive users in close proximity to the development where it is not possible to sufficiently screen views of the development. While we acknowledge new planting and habitat creation will add valuable assets across this area, this is through the introduction of a large-scale solar development in an agricultural landscape. The planting, if establishes as predicted, will also go some way in screening and integrating proposals in views. However, we do note that the reduction in Significant landscape and visual effects predominantly relies upon the successful establishment of the planting scheme.	Landscape and Visual The Applicant acknowledges that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. The effects on landscape and visual amenity are set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement **[APP-035]**. The assessment considers the impacts of the Proposed Development on landscape character areas at a national, regional, district, and local level, as well as the landscape character of the Order Limits itself. As stated in NKDC's relevant representation, the Proposed Development's landscape and visual assessment identified significant landscape effects on landscape character at a district, local and site level during construction and Year 1 of operation, but by Year 15 of operation, significant landscape effects would be limited to the landscape character of the Principal Site and the local landscape character areas that host the solar PV infrastructure, demonstrating the localised nature of landscape impacts. The Proposed Development design has been an iterative process, informed by a suite of technical studies to identify constraints and opportunities across the Order Limits, as discussed in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**. As a part of the design evolution, landscape and visual effects have been reduced by both embedded mitigation and sensitive design. For example, the Applicant has held discussions with the resident at Grange Cottage regarding concerns in relation to impacts on visual amenity from the proposed Solar PV Array within Field 46 (i.e. the field immediately south-east of Grage Cottage). It should be noted that Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[APP-035]**, which was supported by a series of photomontages within Figure 10-10 of the ES **[APP-098]** (VP35b in relation to the view from Grange Cottage), submitted with the DCO application identified potential significant adverse effects in Years 1 and 15 (Winter) of operation of the Proposed Development in relation to the potential visual impact of the Proposed Development. As a result of these comments and ongoing discussions, the Applicant has amended the design of the Proposed Development to remove the Solar PV Array from Field 46. This is secured via the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, and other secured Plans, that have been updated and submitted to the Examination. It should be noted that, in light of this design change, the visual impact at Grange Cottage is reduced to not significant in Years 1 and 15 of operation of the Proposed Development, as set out in the updated version of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, supported by an updated set of photomontages within Figure 10-10 of the ES **[AS-119]**.
	15	The cumulative landscape and visual effects of the proposed development are considered in Chapter 15 of the ES and Section 10.10 of the LVIA. While a 2km ZoI has been utilised for	The approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual effects is consistent with PINS Guidance on Cumulative Effects and follows a proportionate methodology as outlined in GLVIA3.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		schemes to be considered for cumulative landscape and visual effects, four large scale solar projects that are located beyond this distance have also been shortlisted to be considered against Fosse Green Energy for cumulative landscape end visual effects, as identified in paragraph 10.10.2: ID 63. Application Reference: EN010149. Springwell Energy Farm. ID 87. Application Reference: EN010162. Great North Road Solar ID 88. Application Reference: EN010159. One Earth Solar Farm. ID 103. Application Reference: EN0110016. Leoda Solar Farm Of the projects listed within paragraph 10.10.1 and 10.10.2 to be considered in the cumulative assessment, Significant cumulative landscape and visual effects judged to be limited to the scheme and: ID 95. Application Reference: PL/0087/23. North Hykeham Relief Road: Significant landscape and visual effects are identified in the LVIA; ID 63. Application Reference: EN010149. Springwell Energy Farm: Significant landscape and visual effects are identified in the LVIA; ID 103. Application Reference: EN0110016. Leoda Solar Farm: Significant landscape and visual effects are identified in the LVIA. Due to the extent and proximity of additional NSIP scale solar schemes in the area, we would suggest the examination is utilised to explore the potential for Significant effects from these additional schemes, above those identified in the LVIA. These large-scale solar schemes occupy some of the same landscape character areas as Fosse Green Energy Solar. The mass and scale of these projects combined has the potential to lead to adverse effects on landscape character over an extensive area, across the region, which may be completely altered over the operational period, particularly when experienced sequentially for visual receptors travelling through the landscape and experiencing these schemes across potentially several kilometres, albeit with gaps between schemes. These schemes combined, if built, would clearly require the update of any published landscape character assessment, including the NCA's, so as to include large scale solar as a defining land use characteristic as well as agriculture. The Fosse Green Energy scheme would evidently deliver landscape and ecological improvements through mitigation areas and planting. However, this will be dependent upon the information set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (shown on Figure 7.15-1 Landscape Mitigation plan within the OLEMP at Appendix A) which illustrates the mitigation, which should be further explored, and would need to be refined at the detailed design stages. The DCO should include for approval of any subsequent detailed landscape and ecological mitigation scheme (planting works), as referenced in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This should clearly link to any landscape mitigation that is submitted as part of the scheme, and subsequently that which has been assessed as part of the LVIA. This should not just be a management plan, but a detailed landscape scheme clearly identifying plant species, numbers and specifications along with planting details. The DCO should also include for an appropriate period of landscape maintenance, currently referenced at article 30(8), that ties into a period of time identified in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, and would expect an initial 15-year period of management and maintenance as a minimum, which would align with the assessed residual landscape and visual	The cumulative assessment contained in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]** primarily focusses on the cumulative schemes within the 2km Zone of Influence (ZoI), as this was judged to be the geographic area across which landscape and visual effects were most likely to occur, although the nearest NSIP scale solar schemes beyond 2km were also scoped in given their similar scale and typology to the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These found that given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. It is therefore the Applicant's view that the previous examination reports further support the conclusion that significant cumulative effects on landscape and visual receptors resulting from the Proposed Development and other schemes beyond the 2km Zone of Influence are unlikely. <u>Management and Maintenance</u> Section 7 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** secures the need to monitor and review the management prescriptions undertaken. This includes for walkover surveys of the Order Limits to be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. The extent of vegetation clearance is shown on the Maximum Vegetation Removal Plan provided at Figure 3-17 of the ES **[AS-029]**. This corresponds with the FLEMP **[AS-122]** which commits to removing trees and hedgerows only where access is required and where using existing gaps in hedgerows or trees is not considered practical. The implementation of a detailed LEMP including vegetation removal requires approval under Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		effects. This would subsequently be regularly reviewed and monitored at a reasonable period, such as every 3 to 5 years and implemented for the lifetime of the project. This should include for a reasonable plant replacement program, such as following a significant loss or 9 failure to thrive, to ensure the planting scheme meets the aims and objectives laid out in the submission. Proposed vegetation removal is identified within the Draft DCO and Appendix 10-H Arboricultural Impact Assessment. 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. This should clearly relate to vegetation removal plans and AIA, and this must also include vegetation removal or works to facilitate wider highways and access works, such as for abnormal loads.	
	16	**Appendix B** Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment (Infrastructure) Officer Comments Below Ground Heritage Assets – Archaeology Having reviewed the submitted documents, the Council continues to have concerns regarding the level of archaeological assessment undertaken to inform the Applicant's DCO application, particularly given the lack of site-specific impacts for a range of developmental impacts which will have extensive ground impacts including drainage, engineering works, the amount and layout of cabling and landscaping as well as the potential for impacts in ecological mitigation areas such as soil inversion. The Planning Inspectorate stated that 'The ES should contain information on how the results of the desk based and field-based assessments and surveys have informed the ongoing design development and supported the design of an appropriate mitigation strategy.' (6.3 ES Appendix 1-B EIA Scoping Opinion, APP-119, section 3.1 Cultural Heritage) We acknowledge the applicant's assessment work to date, including a desk-based assessment (DBA) and geophysical survey (magnetometry). Some targeted evaluation trenching is currently ongoing. The agreed trenching WSI is for the first phase of trenching (6.3 ES Appendix 7-H Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation, APP-131, Section 1.1) There is currently then a limited data set from trenching results for identifying the presence, depth, date, character, location, state of preservation and significance of archaeology which currently survives across the redline boundary. The current programme of trenching does not include trenches to test areas where these previous techniques have not been successful in identifying archaeological remains. Some areas have not been subject to geophysical survey and while we appreciate there will be access issues there must at some point be access so that the scheme can be built. These unsurveyed areas will need higher levels of evaluation to compensate for the lack of information or else be subject to stronger archaeological mitigation as the potential has not been determined. Any areas of unknown potential will need adequate levels of evaluation in advance of any works including plant movement which may damage or destroy currently surviving but unknown archaeology, otherwise mitigation measures will be required to allow the archaeology to be	The Applicant is of the opinion that the assessment work completed as part of the ES (ES Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially **[APP-127]**, **[APP-129]**, **[APP-130]**, **[APP-132]** is proportionate and fully compliant with the policies of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, the NPPF and the EIA Regulations, and provides an appropriate response to the EIA Scoping Opinion **[APP-119]**. Of particular note (within all of the relevant policies) is the need to understand the specific nature of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development (acknowledged in policy to be 'limited'); to undertake a 'proportionate' assessment of these effects; and to develop mitigation proposals to manage any residual effects. The Applicant acknowledges that a small amount of the Order Limits area was unavailable for the geophysical survey, however the vast majority of that area fall within areas of retained agricultural land or where ecological mitigation areas are proposed (the impacts of which have not yet been subject to detailed design but which are anticipated to be minimal at most). Following the granting of the DCO, additional trenching will be carried out where required, as secured within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]** (which will be finalised following completion of the Final Trial Trenching Report and submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline and supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**), to inform the detailed design and ensure appropriate mitigation measures are put in place. For the avoidance of doubt, the geophysical survey was only one of a number of surveys and assessments that have contributed to the understanding of the archaeological resource across the Order Limits which, together with the Final Trial Trenching Report, provide sufficient information to inform the decision making process with regard to archaeology. The ES Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage **[APP-032]**, specifically Section 7.6 Embedded Mitigation Measures, details key measures that have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development, based on the archaeological surveys completed, including early definition of areas of particular archaeological value to ensure those areas are excluded from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is of the opinion that the design of Proposed Development has been informed by the archaeological work undertaken. With regard to the trial trenching, the scope was designed in response to the above principles, to be proportionate. The current programme of trenching targeted areas of known remains and also tested areas where previous surveys did not identify such remains. This has allowed to confirm at the interim report stage an overall good correlation between the anomalies identified in the geophysical survey **[APP-130]** and during the trial trenching **[APP-132]**. The ES Appendix 7-H Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation **[APP-131]** was subject to consultation with the archaeological advisor at LCC and was approved on 7 May 2025, prior to the evaluation commencing. For the avoidance of doubt, the Final Trial Trenching Report, which

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		planned, investigated and recorded before the groundworks can commence. It is therefore much preferred that sufficient trenching is undertaken across the full Order Limits to provide the essential baseline evidence to design a reasonable and fit for purpose mitigation strategy. Some habitat creation requires ground preparation which would damage or destroy surviving archaeology particularly in land previously in agricultural use where surviving archaeology may be close to the current ground surface. These areas therefore need to be included in the evaluation work and the results can be used to inform the design process effectively. Other significant groundwork impacts from developmental activities will need to inform what further evaluation may be required in order to provide sufficient baseline evidence for a reasonable fit for purpose agreed mitigation strategy to effectively deal with the impact on currently surviving archaeology. Examples of such major impacts are available in a number of the submitted documents. 7.10 Framework Soil Management Plan (Rev 1) APP-192 for example lists the potential uses for soil including 'General use within cut/fill proposals.(section 6.2.3) as well as use 'within the creation of wetlands or SuDS features' (section 6.4.1). There's also the preliminary works in advance of soil placement: 'The receiving surface (in-situ layer of soil) must be de-compacted first prior to placement and spreading. In some instances this receiving layer may require deep ripping.' (section 6.8.2) We note with great interest that this document also states that there will be a 'Topographic survey – determine site levels, changes in elevation, earmark cut and fill locations.'(section 7.2.2) This type of information is critically useful for understanding the site-specific developmental impacts across the scheme, we recommend such technical information be shared as soon as available in order to inform the archaeological evaluation and mitigation process. Table 7-2: Statutory ConsultaϴOn Responses (Cultural Heritage) pp7-31 to 7-56 in 6.1 ES Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage (APP-32) lists the concerns expressed by Lincolnshire County Council and while some of these issues have been noted we remain concerned. The Council maintains that the applicant's submission for buried heritage and the proposed developmental impacts upon it lacks consistency and necessary detail in some areas. Now to concerns regarding specific issues in this scheme's submission documents.	supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]** (and is currently under preparation and to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline), will enable a detailed consideration of the relevant results as part of the decision making process. However, it can be confirmed that the overall results of the trial trenching conform to the summary presented in the interim report, and the results do not materially alter the conclusions presented within the Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** regarding the likely impacts of the Proposed Development and the suitability of the mitigation measures on the archaeological resource. For the avoidance of doubt, the Applicant is committed to ensuring that archaeological remains are taken into account during the detailed design process. The Final Trial Trenching Report will enable a detailed consideration of the relevant data as part of the decision making process. The results of the Final Trial Trenching Report, and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. This will include the Cable Corridor and other areas of potential impacts (such as where below ground impacts in areas of habitat creation or soil management are required). These areas were not subject to trial trenching at this stage, as detailed design is yet to be developed. As part of an iterative approach to the detailed design process, the locations for construction activities associated with the Cable Corridor (or other areas devoid of solar panels) will be fed into the design for a programme of further trial trenching work, which will in turn inform the design process and appropriate mitigation measures. The Applicant is committed to ensuring that archaeological constraints feed into the detailed design, with appropriate mitigation to be agreed. As noted above, the Framework WSI**[AS-001]** will be finalised following completion of the Trial Trenching Report (to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline) and will inform the decision making process. As such, the Applicant is of the opinion that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the significance of archaeological remains and the potential impact of the Proposed Development, and measures to ensure appropriate and proportionate mitigation is included have been built into the process. The Applicant will be liaising with the relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA) to develop the next stage of site-specific WSIs to guide detailed design and post-consent activities, and prior to the carrying out of any archaeological works. The Applicant is of the opinion that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the significance of archaeological remains through a staged process, and the potential impact of the Proposed Development is understood. Crucially, measures to ensure appropriate and proportionate mitigation is included have been built into the process.
	17	2.2 Works Plans APP-008 states that Works no 9 includes 'landscaping, biodiversity and ancillary works.' We are seeing proposed amendments to draft Development Consent Order (DCO) wording from Applicants on other Lincolnshire solar NSIPs for these works they wish to undertake in advance of the main work programme to be specifically excluded from the Archaeological Requirements. We would strongly oppose any proposed DCO wording which excludes any such works.	For the majority of the Requirements in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** the only works that are excluded from the pre-commencement requirements are the 'permitted preliminary works' as these works are excluded from the definition of 'commence' under Article 2(1) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and are themselves defined in Article 2(1). However, in discussions with NKDC prior to the application being submitted, Requirement 11 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** was amended to make clear, at sub-paragraph (3) of that Requirement that: *"for the purposes of sub-paragraph (1), "commence" includes any permitted preliminary works."*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			This means that, unlike the other Requirements in Schedule 2, the provisions in Requirement 11 must be complied with before even the 'permitted preliminary works' can be commenced. There is therefore no provision within the Draft DCO that would exclude the type of works referred to in the Relevant Representation from the need to comply with the archaeological mitigation provided under Requirement 11, and nor is there any intention for such a proposal to be included in the Draft DCO in the future, as demonstrated by the more restricted drafting that the Applicant has already agreed with the Council.
	18	6.1 ES Chapter 9 Water Environment APP-034 lists a variety of developmental impacts during decommissioning as well as construction phases for this scheme: 'Construction activities such as earthworks, excavation, site preparation, levelling, and grading operations result in the disturbance of soils' (section 9.7.4) and also 'Potential impacts from the decommissioning of the Principal Site are similar in nature to those during construction, as some ground works would be required to remove infrastructure installed.' (section 9.7.140) This would of course destroy any currently surviving archaeology in the areas of these works. This is contrary to statements elsewhere in the submission documents that there will be no decommissioning impacts or even construction impacts to archaeology. Rather stunningly 6.1 ES Chapter 16 Summary of Environmental Effects, APP-041 states there will be 'No significant residual effects on Cultural Heritage are predicted during the construction of the Proposed Development.' (Table 16-1: Summary of significant effects during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, and again in Table 16.2 of the operation phase) This single line is inadequate and incorrect. This proposed development may be for a long-term temporary scheme but any developmental impacts across the Order Limits on currently surviving archaeology will be permanent impacts on the non-renewable archaeological resource. This single line is inadequate and incorrect. This proposed development may be for a long-term temporary scheme but any developmental impacts across the Order Limits on currently surviving archaeology will be permanent impacts on the non-renewable archaeological resource.	The Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** discusses potential development impacts on archaeology including during construction and decommissioning phases. Firstly, it should be noted that physical impacts from construction upon archaeological remains would not be reversed (i.e. construction groundworks for BESS would result in truncation of archaeological remains – with appropriate prior mitigation and recording – and as such removal of such infrastructure would not affect any archaeology as it would have already been recorded and removed). However, this Chapter also highlights a degree of uncertainty regarding potential harm upon the archaeological remains during decommissioning phase largely due to unknown techniques/methodology for such works which would be used decades from now. As such, the ES Chapter (paragraph 7.7.49) highlights that appropriate methodology, as presented in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, will be updated as required. As such, if the updated/detailed DEMP at the time of the decommissioning works indicates that any potential work could affect archaeology, appropriate mitigation measures can be agreed with the relevant LPA at the time in order to ensure that the effects remain as established in Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**. With regard to the assessment of the residual effects, the Applicant notes the assessment methodology, as presented in the Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** and the discussion of impacts. Throughout the discussion, permanent impacts upon archaeological remains are acknowledged, where applicable. The consideration of the residual effects takes into account not only the level (and duration – in this case, permanence) of the impact, but also the values of the assets affected and the mitigation proposed. The Applicant is of the opinion that this assessment has been completed and suitable mitigation can be delivered, and the delivery of the mitigation, to be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA), will ensure the residual effect will be neutral (with different mitigation options available including no-impact solutions, or benefits of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording, delivering benefits which would offset the loss of remains).
	19	6.3 ES Appendix 9-D Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy APP-147 makes reference to lined swales, 'infiltration swales lining the boundaries of these seven fields' (section 4.1.10), edge swales which 'will be sized and located accordingly to capture as much excess overland surface water runoff that can be reasonably accommodated' (section 4.1.12) and 'a new open green ditch.' (section 4.1.13). There will be over 6 hectares of 'the proposed impermeable areas' (Section 4.2.2), swales will be approximately 0.6m deep (section 4.4.8) and for the seven fields which will need edge swales there are spaces 'suitable for up to 300m, 6m wide and 0.6m deep.' (section 4.5.5). Archaeology survives across this scheme at less than half that depth. These and all the other substantial ground impacts from proposed development works will need reasonable evaluation and where necessary appropriate mitigation measures to effectively deal with impacts on surviving archaeology.	The Applicant has acknowledged the range of potential impacts upon the archaeological remains throughout the submission documents, including Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** The impact assessment has been undertaken on the basis of a reasonable worst-case scenario in terms of archaeological impacts. As such, the worst-case parameters considered within the assessment are likely to exacerbate the impacts that would arise as a result of the detailed design, whereby the impacts in reality will likely be less than those reported. Appendix 9-D Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** specifically explains that those swales 'are to be designed' (paragraph 4.1.10). The Applicant is committed to ensure that archaeological remains are taken into account during the detailed design process. The results of the Final Trial Trenching Report, and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. This will include areas of potential impacts (including areas of below ground impacts from work such as establishment of swales or drainage). These areas were not subject to trial

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
			trenching at this stage, as detailed design is yet to be developed. As part of an iterative approach to the detailed design process, the locations for construction activities will be fed into the design for a programme of further trial trenching work, which will in turn inform the design process and appropriate mitigation measures. The Applicant is committed to ensuring that archaeological constraints feed into the detailed design process, with appropriate mitigation to be agreed, ensuring that the residual effects do not exceed those reported within Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**.
	20	6.4 Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary (Rev 1) APP-180 states that 'The significance of the potential effects on known and potential buried archaeological remains (including late prehistoric/Roman remains, medieval remains and agricultural features) before additional mitigation ranged from neutral to moderate adverse. However, following the implementation of the embedded and additional mitigation measures, it is considered that in the worst-case scenario, the residual effect on buried archaeological remains would be a neutral (not significant). (section 6.3.10) We do not agree. Trenching evaluation is ongoing and the full report on the findings has yet to be produced. Some mitigation options have been listed but there is no site-specific fit for purpose mitigation strategy. Having undertaken site monitoring visits during the trenching fieldwork certainly there are areas of significant surviving archaeology within the Order Limits of this scheme. The potential effects cannot be said to be 'neutral to moderate' when 'potential buried archaeological remains' have yet to be located, identified or characterised. This is a reductive assumption, and until there is sufficient baseline evidence for an informed understanding of the significance of surviving archaeology within the Order Limits we recommend that potential effects be 'high' until proven otherwise. The worst-case scenario would not be 'neutral' as stated above, rather it would be that currently unknown significant archaeology is destroyed by development works without recording. This is contrary to national policy and guidance including the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan which states that 'Development affecting archaeological remains, whether known or potential, designated or undesignated, should take every practical and reasonable step to protect and, where possible, enhance their significance.' (Policy S57 The Historic Environment, p126) Section 6.3.10 of the Non-Technical Summary goes on to state that: 'Additional mitigation comprising a programme of archaeological investigation and recording would deliver benefits which would offset the loss of remains and allow for this already non-significant adverse effect to be further reduced or potentially avoided completely.' The ability to record archaeology which is destroyed by development is not a 'benefit' it is simply preservation by record rather than preservation in situ of archaeological remains. NPPF states that 'the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.' (para 218) National policy and guidance and professional standards have a presumption in favour of preservation in situ. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan for example states that 'Wherever possible and appropriate, mitigation strategies should ensure the preservation of archaeological remains in-situ.' (p125) Section 6.3.14 and 6.3.15 of the Non-Technical Summary state there will be no impacts to below ground archaeological remains during the operational and maintenance phases of the development nor during decommissioning activities. This does not agree with a number of the	The comment is acknowledged but the Applicant is of the view that the process for the assessment of the archaeological resource, design and mitigation ensures that the residual effects would be neutral and not significant. The Applicant is of the view that this assessment has been completed and suitable mitigation can be delivered, and the delivery of the mitigation, to be agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA), will ensure the residual effect will be neutral (with different mitigation options available including no-impact solutions, or benefits of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording, delivering benefits which would offset the loss of remains). The Applicant appreciates archaeological remains are located within the Order Limits, for which appropriate mitigation measures are, or will be, agreed, and wholly disagrees with the statement that archaeological remains would be destroyed without recording. It should be noted that, as per Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, the CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and construction of the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. CH-C1) notes: "*Where impacts to below ground archaeological remains as a result of the Proposed Development cannot be avoided, an appropriate programme of archaeological investigation and recording will be undertaken, with the objective of advancing the understanding of the significance of archaeological remains within the DCO Site that may be disturbed or either wholly or partially lost. The fieldwork will be undertaken prior to the commencement of construction works but may also include monitoring and recording works during construction. The detailed CEMP(s) will reflect mitigation required during construction which will be set out in the WSI and include measures such as ensuring monitoring is in place where required*." DCO requirements are legally binding and enforceable by the LPA, as such the various management plans secured under the DCO requirements must be complied with; failure to comply with the provisions of the various management plans (and other measures) secured under the DCO requirements would be a breach of the terms of a DCO, which is a criminal offence. As such, the destruction of archaeological remains without recording would be a criminal offence. The results of the Final Trial Trenching Report, and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. As part of an iterative approach to the detailed design process, the locations for construction activities will be fed into the design for a programme of further trial trenching work, which will in turn inform the design process and appropriate mitigation measures. This staged approach to further investigation of those additional areas is presented within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**, which will be finalised following completion of the Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**) and submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline to inform the decision making process. The Applicant will be liaising with relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA) to develop the next stage of site-specific WSIs to guide the detailed design process and post-consent activities, and prior to the carrying out of any archaeological works. As such, it is considered that there are appropriate measures in place to ensure there will be no significant effects.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		submission documents which list specific impacts for every phase of this scheme, examples of which are included in this response.	With regard to preservation in-situ, the Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** and the Framework WSI **[AS-001]** highlight the option to preserve remains in situ where possible (and required, depending on the value of the assets), with measures to ensure such remains are protected from additional construction impacts to be described within the detailed CEMP, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, ref. measure CH-C1. As such, whilst the potential for impacts from the Proposed Development cannot be entirely removed, preservation in-situ forms part of the approach to archaeological mitigation. Where archaeology will be affected, the Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** clarifies that the loss of evidential value of archaeological remains (truncation of the physical remains) would be offset by the enhanced historical value (advancement of our understanding of the remains) as well as the public benefits the dissemination of the results would deliver. It makes it clear therefore that it is not only the preservation by record (mitigation measures which will be agreed with the Local Authority), but public benefits stemming from this that are being taken into account in the overall balance regarding the effects. In 2017, the judgment of the High Court in *R (Hayes) v City of York Council* **[2017]** EWHC 1374 (Admin), commonly referred to as the Cliffords Tower judgment, set out the correct reading and application of paragraph 218 of the NPPF, which should be as follows: “the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a *decisive* factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted”. Thus, the High Court decreed that we need to give weight to the public (heritage) benefits of archaeological investigations. The Applicant would like to clarify that the Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** acknowledges impacts during operation/maintenance and decommissioning phases of the development are unlikely (considering replacement infrastructure would be within areas where impacts had been incurred during construction), however the detailed OEMP and DEMP will specify appropriate measures (i.e. Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**, ref. CH-O2, which states ‘*If potential for archaeological impacts is identified, appropriate mitigation measures would be agreed with the relevant local authority’*).
	21	6.5 Environmental Commitments Register (Rev 1), APP-183, Cultural Heritage makes reference to ‘low level piling and avoidance of archaeology from key areas of impact within Solar PV Areas (such as Solar stations or access tracks)’ and ‘small exclusion zones (around remains of particular significance) or no-dig solutions such as ballast footings (to be discussed with the archaeological advisor) to avoid piling completely, or areas where cabling is excluded (to reduce any impacts to the low level piling only).’ . (pp9-10) These measures are insufficient. The use of low level piling will make similar detrimental impacts to standard piling in archaeology that’s 30 to 50cm from the current ground surface, for example on burials and structured deposition in discrete features. Any proposed mitigation measure must be informed by an understanding of the state of preservation and the nature of the surviving archaeology. On another Lincolnshire solar NSIP unexpected Saxon burials were found 20cm from the ground surface in a very delicate state of preservation. Use of any of these proposed measures would destroy them without identification or recording. In the event of preservation in situ mitigation, the full extent of the archaeological areas must be determined and each area must be fenced off and subject to a programme of monitoring throughout the construction and the decommissioning phases. There will be no ground disturbance whatsoever which may disturb or affect the archaeological remains, including plant movement or storage. The proposal for ‘no-dig solutions’ requires a full understanding of the depth, extent, importance and significance of archaeology. Any proposal in archaeologically sensitive areas will require a firm evidence base proving that any proposed work including	The Applicant considers that the potential for preservation in situ represents a suitable mitigation measure for sensitive archaeological remains where identified (as those remains would not incur any impacts) – the piling was one of the options (not the only option provided). The iterative process of archaeological evaluation and detailed design would ensure that such remains are identified and appropriate measures put in place (see the Framework WSI **[AS-001]** which will be updated and submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline following completion of the Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**), and subsequent site specific WSIs to be agreed with the relevant local authority). Low level piling (which is called low not because of the depth, but because of the limited footprint and low frequency) is an appropriate measure for other less sensitive remains as the impacts are limited to small discrete areas, with the vast majority of the feature unaffected, preserving those other areas in situ for future investigation if required). As part of the Proposed Development, there is the commitment to ensure that archaeological remains to be preserved in-situ as part of the mitigation are protected from impacts, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, ref. measure CH-C1. Details of appropriate measures will be informed by the understanding of the archaeological resource informed by the ongoing and further trial trenching, and defined within the detailed CEMP, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, ref. measure CH-C1, to ensure those reflect the development design, specific construction methods and archaeological remains. Measures such as fencing off of areas, use or appropriate equipment and monitoring, and any other specific measures which

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		decommissioning will have no impact upon the archaeology including not only direct destructive impact through groundworks, compaction or reduction in the depth of soil necessary for protecting the archaeology but also through environmental changes which would be detrimental to the surviving archaeology.	respond to the context of the site, are commonly applied and can be specified within the detailed CEMP.
	22	7.7 Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) APP-189 states that 'Where exclusion zones or non-intrusive methods are required, the detailed CEMP(s) will include a strategy which will detail appropriate good practice measures during construction (such as use of appropriate equipment or limiting avoiding heavy plant movements during inclement weather on sensitive areas to avoid damage to below ground remains etc.) and ways of monitoring of this.' (3.3 Cultural Heritage, Table 2: Cultural Heritage, CH-C1) This is absolutely unacceptable. No works whatsoever will be undertaken in known archaeologically sensitive areas whether they are 'exclusion zones' or areas using non-intrusive mitigation measures. Archaeology is known to survive here less than 30cm from the ground surface as seen in the evaluation trenching. Machine tracking alone will destroy archaeological deposits where there is insufficient depth of soil to protect the remains from compaction and wheel ruts. Please see paragraph above in response to 6.5 Environmental Commitments Register (Rev 1), APP-183. Regarding 7.9 Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) APP-191, we do not agree with the statement that 'The decommissioning phase is not expected to result in any impact beyond the already-disturbed footprint of the Proposed Development. Therefore, it is not anticipated that decommissioning activities will have a direct physical impact upon buried archaeological remains.' (3.3: Cultural Heritage, Table 2, CH-D1, p13) There is no information on how hundreds of thousands of piles will be dealt with to restore land to its previous agricultural use. There are also references in the Framework DEMP to: 'measures to avoid animals being injured or killed within decommissioning working areas' which states that excavations should not remain open overnight and if so that 'ramps will be provided to allow animals a means of escape.' (Table 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, ECO-D1 part b, p14) and that 'Measures may include use and maintenance of temporary lagoons, tanks, bunds' and that 'Where practical, any earthworks will be undertaken during the drier months of the year' (3.5 Water Environment, Table 4, WAT-D2, p21)	As part of the DCO submission, there is the commitment to ensure that archaeological remains to be preserved in-situ as part of the mitigation are protected from impacts, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, ref. measure CH-C1. The Applicant is of the opinion that appropriate measures will be defined within the detailed CEMP, reflecting by the understanding of the archaeological resource (informed by the ongoing and further trial trenching), specific construction methods and detailed design. There needs to be an understanding that where non-intrusive methods are proposed, some machinery movement will be required to facilitate construction, but this can be done using appropriate equipment in the right conditions (and not heavy machinery on saturated ground). The details will depend on the detailed design and the mitigation measures proposed, and those can be agreed in the detailed CEMP. The Applicant would also like to highlight the opportunities the Proposed Development brings to define appropriate measures to protect such remains (with no protection currently in place from regular ploughing and movement of farm machinery which result in impacts such as wheel ruts or plough scars). With regard to the decommissioning impacts, Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** acknowledges a degree of uncertainty regarding potential harm upon the archaeological remains during the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development largely due to unknown techniques/methodology for such works which would be applied decades from now. As such, the ES Chapter (paragraph 7.7.49) highlights that appropriate methodology as presented in Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, will be updated as required in line with relevant guidance at the time. If any measures such as quoted from the Framework DEMP will be required, and those would result in impacts upon archaeological resource in areas that were not previously subject to construction impacts, specific measures to ensure archaeological protection and recording can be agreed within detailed DEMP. Whilst at this stage any potential impacts are anticipated to be immaterial/negligible, if it becomes apparent that decommissioning works could affect archaeology, appropriate mitigation measures can be agreed with the relevant planning authority at the time (both through appropriate design, safeguarding measures specified in detailed DEMP or archaeological mitigation through recording prior to impacts being incurred).
	23	7.9 Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) APP-191 does however include Environmental and Ecological Clerks of Works in section 2.2.1 Key roles and responsibilities. An Archaeological Clerk of Works will also be required as well as an agreed Archaeological Management Plan which will remain in place for the lifetime of the scheme until the end of the scheme's decommissioning phase to ensure that impacts on archaeological and unevaluated areas are dealt with in a reasonable and enforceable way with appropriate archaeological mitigation where required. The air photo and LiDAR report 'has identified tentative evidence for an Iron Age and/or Roman settlement on the east bank of the River Brant, extensive medieval or post medieval agricultural landscapes, and a small number of (WWII) military buildings, structures and other features.' (6.3 ES Appendix 7-F Air Photo and LiDAR Mapping and Interpretation, APP-129)	The Applicant considers that if it becomes apparent that decommissioning works could affect archaeology, appropriate mitigation measures can be agreed with the relevant planning authority at the time (both through appropriate design, safeguarding measures specified in detailed DEMP or archaeological mitigation through recording prior to impacts being incurred). If deemed necessary, an Archaeological Clerk of Works and Archaeological Management Plan can be agreed as part of the decision-making process, with details submitted following the DCO being granted. The Applicant acknowledges the remaining comments on the recorded and potential archaeological remains and trial trenching. The Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**) will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline and appropriate

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation	Response to North Kesteven District Council Relevant Representation
		The geophysical survey report results show a 'Potentially Bronze Age through to Post Med agricultural landscape with IA/Roman and Med settlements and activity.' (6.3 ES Appendix 7-G Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report, APP-130) The interim trenching report states that 'Based on preliminary dating evidence, the majority of the activity appears to date to the later prehistoric and Roman periods, with some possible evidence for medieval, post-medieval and modern activity across the Principal Site.' (Section 4.1, 6.3 ES Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim), APP-132) And while the trenches are proving the geophysical survey results they are also ground-truthing further activity with the discovery of features not identified through geophysical survey. (Section 4.2, as above) The interim trenching report also recorded that 'relatively thin topsoil cover was observed in many of the fields. (Section 4.1, as above) Archaeology has been identified across the Order Limits and trenching has demonstrated that archaeology survives at less than 30cm from the ground surface. This scheme is on a landscape scale: at 1368 hectares there will undoubtedly be currently unknown surviving archaeology. Virtually any groundworks or plant movement would damage or destroy any surviving archaeology here which has not been adequately evaluated or identified for mitigation measures appropriate to its significance. Post-consent trenching leaves a high degree of risk pushed into the post-consent phase with the potential for archaeological works to impact the work programme and budget. It is essential therefore that archaeological work including field evaluation as well as mitigation phases can be dealt with by future commitments through the documentation including approved WSIs and the production of an agreed Archaeological Management Plan with an Archaeological Clerk of Works for the lifetime of the scheme. We will continue to work with the Applicant's archaeological consultant as more detail is provided regarding site-specific developmental impacts to ensure that reasonable and appropriate evaluation and mitigation are undertaken to adequately deal with the impacts on surviving archaeological remains across the Order Limits.	evaluation and mitigation will be carried out following the granting of the DCO, to adequately identify surviving archaeological remains across the Order Limits which may be affected by the construction works and define appropriate mitigation measures to ensure the remains are either protected or appropriately recorded.

3.2 Lincolnshire County Council

Table 3-2: Applicant's Responses to Local Authorities' Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire County Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
RR-157	1	**Grid Connection** It is noted that Fosse Green Energy has a grid connection agreement which relies on connection to a new substation being promoted by National Grid at Navenby. The Grid Connection Statement **[APP-200]**, states that engagement with NESO provides a connection date of 2033. The proposed new Navenby substation will require consent under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The National Grid project website indicates that the planning application would be submitted in early 2026, with construction commencing mid to late 2026 and a fully operational substation being achieved by winter 2029. At the time of writing no planning application for the proposed new Navenby substation has been submitted. Construction of the Fosse Green Energy Project according to Paragraph 3.4.1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3: Proposed Development **[APP-028]** is proposed to commence in 2031. LCC acknowledges the proposed timescales of the two projects. However, the Fosse Green Energy Project is contingent upon the Navenby substation being granted planning permission and being delivered within the indicated timeframe, with limited flexibility for delays. The certainty of a grid connection being available and therefore the overall deliverability of the project is a concern for the Council, and this matter will be expanded upon in our LIR.	Grid Connection Given the generally supportive national and local policy position, and on the basis that National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) take a responsible approach to siting, design and mitigation, in compliance with the 'Horlock Rules', there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant why consent for the Navenby substation and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would be withheld. At the time of writing, the anticipated timeline provided for the Navenby Substation on NGET's website estimates that a planning application under the TCPA 1990 will be submitted to NKDC in early 2026 for permission to construct and operate the Navenby Substation. This anticipated timeline estimates that the application will be determined in Spring 2026 and, subject to approval, NGET indicated that construction is hoped to begin mid/late 2026. This timeline estimates that the completion date will be late 2029. The Applicant wishes to reiterate that this is the anticipated timeline set out by NGET at the time of writing, and the Applicant does not have information beyond that which is available in the public domain. This is around 3.5 years ahead of the connection date proposed for the Proposed Development and there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant as to why consent for the Navenby substation and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would be withheld.
	2	**Minerals and Waste** *Minerals and Waste Safeguarding* As identified in the applicant's Minerals Safeguarding Assessment (APP-162), the project proposals intersect with Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) identified in the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (LMWLP) for sand and gravel, for limestone and for multiple specific sites. The applicant's main argument, in deducing that the minerals resources won't be sterilised, appears to be that the development is of a temporary nature. LCC remain concerned, however, due to: • The proposed 60-year lifespan goes well beyond the timeline covered by the LMWLP, LCC are unable to confirm whether any of these mineral resources will be required before the site would be decommissioned. • The applicant's Assessment suggests that 'the connection cables have the option to remain in situ or be removed'. If they were to remain in situ, that may inhibit future extraction. The Council will provide any further comments on minerals and waste safeguarding in the LIR.	Minerals and Waste *Minerals and Waste Safeguarding* While the site will be used for solar energy generation and battery energy storage, permission is sought for a temporary period. The Proposed Development comprises a temporary installation and at the end of the operational life of the Proposed Development, the infrastructure will be removed, and the land returned the landowners and will be available for its original use, noting that the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed, in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**.(ref. paragraph 2.3.5). The non-permanent and reversible nature of a solar NSIP with 60 year consent has also been acknowledged in the Secretary of State's decisions on other solar NSIPs, such as Tillbridge Solar Farm, Mallard Pass Solar Project, West Burton and Gate Burton Energy Parks, which have all been granted consent. Whilst the lifespan of the Proposed Development exceeds the timeline of the updated Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, which will have a plan period up to 2041, the Applicant notes that LCC are unable to confirm whether any mineral resources in the Mineral Safeguarding Area will be required before the Proposed Development would be decommissioned. As set out in the Appendix 12-C: Minerals Safeguarding Assessment of the ES **[AS-091]**, given the reversible nature of the Proposed Development, there will be no permanent sterilisation of the mineral resource, and the ability of future generations to extract the resource over the long term will not be compromised. Furthermore, given the large landbank of sand and gravel and limestone in Lincolnshire, the Proposed Development will not inhibit extraction within the timescale that the mineral is likely to be needed and will ultimately have a negligible impact on sterilising the mineral resource. In addition, there are a number of locations where the

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			thickness of the mineral is negligible or limited meaning extraction would not be economical. The land take for the Cable Corridor is small, and thus the area of potential sterilisation would be negligible. As stated, Section 2.3 of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** provides flexibility as to the method of cable decommissioning. Cables and cable ducting could either be left in situ or removed by opening the ground at regular intervals and pulling the cable through to the extraction point, avoiding the need to open up the entire length of the Cable Corridor. The mode of cable decommissioning for the Cable Corridor and interconnecting cables will be dependent upon government policy, the preferences of the County and best practice at the time of the decommissioning phase. Should the County wish for the connection cables to be removed, this would be discussed and agreed prior to decommissioning.
	3	*Waste Management* Whilst waste has been scoped out of the ES as a separate chapter, LCC welcome the applicants' reference to the topic including the waste hierarchy and proximity principle in several documents, including ES Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**. The waste impacts have been assessed on the assumption of landfilling. Whilst this is in line with standard methodology, the applicant should make every effort to follow the waste hierarchy for all waste streams. The Council will have some points of detail in relation to the lack of current capacity for recycling solar panels, particularly at decommissioning, but also waste generated during construction, operational failures and the need for panel replacement during the life of the development and cumulative impacts alongside other proposed NSIP scale solar farms, particularly in terms of waste management capacity. LCC notes that forecasts for waste arisings are either incomplete or absent from the current suite of documents. These will need to be provided for each phase of the project, including details of quantity and proposed fate for each waste type. Construction waste forecasts have failed to take account of PV panels and other WEEE damaged during this phase. The 0.05% per year PV panel failure rate also seems rather low and needs to be justified. These points will be considered further in the LIR.	*Waste Management* As outlined in paragraph 14.5.55 of Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** "*The Proposed Development will aim to prioritise waste prevention, followed by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy.*" Forecasts for waste arisings are outlined in Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]**: • Construction – refer to Table 14-24 Estimated Construction Waste, the specific waste management route would be confirmed by the construction contractor however the wastes listed are recyclable or recoverable; • Operation – refer to paragraph 14.5.84 Component Replacement Waste; and • Decommissioning – refer to Table 14-25 Estimated Decommissioning Waste, the specific waste management route would be confirmed by the decommissioning contractor however the wastes listed are recyclable or recoverable. Assuming a 2-year construction period and a failure rate of 0.05% as outlined in the operational Component Replacement Waste section (paragraph 14.5.84) of Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** failed panels during the construction phase of the Proposed Development would result in 78 m^3 of waste. The failure rate of 0.05% is based on a 2017 study by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)[11] which found a median annual failure rate of 5 per 10,000 panels for solar photovoltaic (PV) systems installed between 2000 and 2015. This is equivalent to an annual failure rate of 0.05%. The study analysed data from over 4,500 globally deployed panels and 50,000 installed systems. With the improvement of panel reliability this is considered a worst-case failure rate.
	4	**Built Heritage** Having reviewed the submitted documents, the Council continues to have concerns regarding the level of archaeological assessment undertaken to inform the applicants DCO application.	Response to LCC Archaeology (provided under Built Heritage heading) The Applicant acknowledges the comments but is of the opinion that the assessment work completed as part of the ES (Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially **[APP-127]**, **[APP-129]**, **[APP-130]**, **[APP-132]** is proportionate and fully compliant with the policies of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, the NPPF and the EIA Regulations. Of particular note (within all of the relevant policies) is the need to understand the specific nature of

[11] Photovoltaic Failure and Degradation Modes (2017) Jordan, D.C, Silverman, T.J, Wohlgemuth, J.H, Kurtz, S.R and VanSant, K.T.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		LCC acknowledges the applicant's assessment work to date, including a desk-based assessment (DBA), geophysical survey (magnetometry) and a first phase of targeted evaluation trenching which is currently ongoing. The applicant's own DBA and evaluation work so far shows that archaeology has been identified across the Order Limits. There is currently a very limited data set from trenching results for identifying the presence, depth, date, character, location, state of preservation and significance of archaeology which currently survives across the redline boundary. The current programme of trenching also fails to adequately test areas where these previous techniques have not been successful in identifying archaeological remains. Any areas of unknown potential will need adequate levels of evaluation in advance of any works including plant movement which may damage or destroy currently surviving but unknown archaeology without identification or recording. While some of these concerns can be addressed through a robust programme of investigation work post-consent, LCC would expect that at the application/examination stage, the applicant at least would have evaluated those areas that they themselves have identified as have having significant archaeological potential. There are also concerns regarding the reductive approach to the impacts of the development upon the unrenewable archaeological resource which currently survives across the Order Limits. The submission documents state there will be no significant residual effects from decommissioning impacts or even construction impacts to archaeology. These documents also list activities such as earthworks, excavations, site preparation, levelling, grading operations, cut and fill and de-compacting. The evaluation trenching has demonstrated that archaeology survives at less than 30cm from the ground surface. We do not therefore agree the Applicant's worst-case scenario that the residual effect on buried archaeological remains would be neutral. These and all the other substantial ground impacts from proposed development works will need reasonable evaluation and where necessary appropriate mitigation measures to effectively deal with impacts on surviving archaeology. The Council maintains that the applicant's submission for buried heritage and the proposed developmental impacts upon it lacks consistency and necessary detail in some areas. This opens the scheme to significant risk in terms of deliverability as proposed and may lead to unnecessary delays, cost increases and unfavourable outcomes for the buried heritage within the Order Limits. The Council will provide more detailed comments within the Local Impact Report.	the potential impacts of the Proposed Development (acknowledged in policy to be 'limited'); to undertake a 'proportionate' assessment of these effects; and to develop mitigation proposals to manage any residual effects. The strategy, extent and scope, and specific technical details of the assessment adopted has been agreed by Historic England (HE) and Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) at all stages; as can be seen in Appendix 7-H: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation of the ES **[APP-131]** which was approved by both HE and LCC. HE and LCC have been engaged in discussions with the on-going work, with LCC and HE attending site visits during the trial trenching work. A meeting on the subject of the completed trial trenching work was undertaken on 6 January 2026, where the positive and collaborative working between all parties continued. The trial trenching was designed in response to the above, to be proportionate, and targeted both areas of known remains and tested areas where previous surveys did not identify such remains, and this has allowed to confirm at the interim report stage an overall good correlation between the anomalies identified in the geophysical survey **[APP-130]** and during the trial trenching **[APP-132]**. Appendix 7-H Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation of the ES **[APP-131]** was subject to consultation with the archaeological advisor at LCC and was approved on 7 May 2025, prior to the evaluation commencing. For the avoidance of doubt, the Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**), is currently under preparation and to be submitted to the Examination at a the next available examination deadline, and will enable a detailed consideration of the relevant results as part of the decision making process. It should be noted, however, that the overall results from the final evaluation conform to the summary presented in the interim report submitted with the DCO application **[APP-132]**. As such, whilst appropriate mitigation measures will be required, the final results do not materially alter the conclusions presented within the Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** regarding the likely impacts of the Proposed Development and the suitability of the mitigation measures on the archaeological resource. The results of the Final Trial Trenching Report, and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design process, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. This will include the Cable Corridor, which has not been subject to trial trenching at this stage, as detailed design for this area is yet to be developed. As part of an iterative approach to the detailed design process, the locations for construction activities associated with the Cable Corridor will be fed into the design for a programme of further trial trenching work, which will in turn inform the design process and appropriate mitigation measures. This staged approach to further investigation of those additional areas is presented within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]** which will be finalised following completion of the Trial Trenching Report (to be submitted at a future Examination deadline). The Applicant will be liaising with relevant LPA to develop the next stage of site-specific WSIs to guide detailed design and post-consent activities, and prior to the carrying out of any archaeological works. As such, the Applicant is of the view that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the significance of archaeological remains and the potential impact of the Proposed Development, and measures to ensure appropriate and proportionate mitigation is included have been built into the process. The Applicant is of the opinion that this assessment has been completed and suitable mitigation can be delivered, and the delivery of the mitigation, to be agreed with the relevant LPA, will ensure the residual effect will be neutral (with different mitigation options available including no-impact solutions, or benefits of a programme of

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			archaeological investigation and recording, delivering benefits which would offset the loss of remains). When further comments are provided within the Local Impact Report, these will be responded to accordingly.
	5	**Cultural Heritage** *Study Area and approach to assessment* LCC maintains that a 2km study area should be adopted for above-ground designated heritage assets (1km for non-designated assets). This reflects precedent on other schemes in Lincolnshire and would ensure assets with wider setting relationships are fully considered. The settings assessment (Appendix 7-D) adopts a selective approach which has resulted in the exclusion of certain assets from detailed consideration, particularly beyond 1km of the order limits. The treatment of group value remains underdeveloped. Assets such as historic farmsteads, dispersed hamlets, and rural churches derive significance from their collective contribution to historic landscape character. Assessing each in isolation risks fragmenting cultural narratives. For example, farmsteads such as Tonge's Farm, Jubilee Farm, and Halfway House are acknowledged but their contribution to the wider agrarian landscape is assessed in isolation. Additionally, LCC makes the following points regarding the assessment of individual assets: • River Farmhouse (Grade II, NHLE 1168186) and Grange Cottage (Grade II, NHLE 1061951): Assessed as "less than substantial harm (lower end)". LCC is not persuaded this adequately reflects their sensitivity given their open, rural settings and the scale/industrial character of the solar arrays. • Other assets on the site boundary (all Grade II or Grade II*): Hill Cottage (NHLE 1360507); Corner Farmhouse (NHLE 1061953); Church of St Germain (NHLE 1061972) and associated Rectory (NHLE 1061973); Churchyard Cross (NHLE 1013082); Morton Manor and Grange (NHLE 1061930 and 1317323); Hall Close (NHLE 1021080); Thurlby Hall and outbuildings (NHLE 1317332). Each faces similar challenges to significance through harm to setting that appears understated. • Tonge's Farm (non-designated, MLI119774): Concluded as "very limited harm", but this underestimates its agrarian context and its potential group value with adjacent historic farmsteads. • Somerton Castle (NHLE 1061974): LCC notes HE's identification of this asset and its wider associate links, including its relationship with the Roman road corridor, as a particular sensitivity that requires fuller consideration.	Cultural Heritage *Study Area and approach to assessment* With regard to the study areas for the assessment, the Applicant acknowledges there is a difference of opinion regarding suitable scope of assessment between the consultees. As clarified in the Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, the approach to study areas was agreed through consultation with Historic England, who approved of the flexible approach to setting matters at the Scoping stage, and this approach was further discussed and agreed in a meeting on 31 March 2025 between Historic England and Cotswold Archaeology. As such, following Historic England advice, the flexible approach, based on expertise and not constrained by fixed radii, was utilised in the submission documents, and it is considered that this approach provides sufficient understanding of the cultural heritage resource and the potential impacts from the Proposed Development. The historic landscape aspects are considered not only within the settings assessment **[APP-127]** but also within the Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment of the ES **[APP-128]** and the Applicant is of the opinion that a proportionate level of assessment with regard to historic landscape was undertaken taking into account the overall significance and impacts from the Proposed Development. With regard to the assets for which additional comments have been raised, the following response is provided: - Regarding River Farmhouse, the assessment of level of harm upon the Listed Building, taking into consideration the asset's heritage significance and its setting, the Proposed Development and mitigation measures, was presented within the detailed settings assessment within the Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]** in line with Historic England guidance. This focused on aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance (Historic England guidance clarifies that not all elements of setting contribute), and the Applicant is of the opinion that the assessment has accurately described the aspects of the setting of River Farmhouse which do contribute. These include, in summary, the gardens, associated farm range (and associated views), wider setting of agricultural land, and longer distance views in which the asset can be experienced (several views from the east have been highlighted, including from parts of Clay Pit Lane or footpaths). It should also be highlighted that those views which contribute have been taken into account, with no development between River Farm and Clay Pit Lane. However, any movement along Clay Pit Lane cannot be considered as contributing to the asset's significance, both as visibility of the Listed Building from the lane is obscured from many locations (and as such the farmhouse cannot be experienced in those views), but also as no such views (if they were afforded more greatly) form part of the conscious design (in contrast to, for instance, a drive approach through a parkland). In response to the assessment of impact, the Applicant would like to stress, as per Historic England guidance, that settings is not itself a heritage asset and as such the assessment of impact must be directed to change

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			to the significance of the heritage asset (not just the change to the setting). Here, the Proposed Development will change part of the asset's wider setting (the historic and architectural interest of the Listed Building itself, and the contribution to the heritage significance from the asset's immediate setting will not be affected at all). As such, although there will be a change within the wider setting, its overall effect on the significance of the asset will be minor (as only part of the asset's setting and experience will be affected), and the conclusion within the assessment (which found the overall harm to be within the lower end of less than substantial harm) to be accurate. - Regarding Grange Cottage, the Applicant acknowledges the comment and considers that Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]** provides an appropriate assessment of the harm to the asset from the Proposed Development. Additional consultations with Historic England were held on 15 September 2025 during an in person meeting on site to discuss the layout of the Proposed Development in proximity to Grange Cottage. In response to Historic England concerns regarding the proximity of solar PV to Grange Cottage and heritage assets at Aubourn, the Proposed Development design has been altered to remove panels from field 46. The outcomes of these consultations are summarised within the SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England (which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**) and the changes reflected within updated plans and photomontages, which have been submitted to the Examination as part of Change Request 1 **[AS-103]**. In summary, whilst the Applicant is of the opinion that the assessment of lower end of less than substantial harm is accurate, the response to remove the panels will ameliorate or resolve the LCC concerns too. - Regarding 'Other assets on the site boundary' – the Applicant believes this description to be misleading, as the distance from the Order Limits boundary varies (i.e. the Rectory is c 155m to the east), and, which is even more pertinent, does not take account of the distance from components of the Proposed Development which could alter the setting and affect significance of those assets (thus implying that proximity from the Order Limits Boundary, regardless of the proposed uses of the proximate areas of the Order Limits or associated impacts, could lead to harm). The Applicant considers that the Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]** provides a proportionate level of assessment with regard to potential impacts from the Proposed Development upon those designated heritage assets, many of which, due to distance from components of the Proposed Development (Solar PV panels, solar stations, substation etc.), would have no potential to be affected, and which could be scoped out at Step 1 on this basis. Where potential for impacts was highlighted, those assets were assessed in more detail within Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]**. In summary: - Grade II Listed Corner Farmhouse was assessed in detail, and it was concluded that Proposed Development has taken into account the setting of the asset, with the areas immediately west of it devoid from above ground elements, with solar panels proposed at distance of *c.* 330m to the north-west, *c*. 670m to the west and *c*. 550 to the south-east. The Proposed Development will not physically or experientially alter the building's immediate garden setting or the fields immediately surrounding the garden plot, therefore resulting in no harm. - Assets in Thurlby (Grade II* listed Church of St Germain, Grade II Rectory and Thurlby Hall) were also assessed in detail. The assessment concluded that the Proposed Development was designed to ensure the rural experience of the assets is retained (with solar panels introduced at distance of *c*. 480m south of the Rectory, 590m west, 510m north-west of the Hall and 500m north-west and 360m north-east of the Church). This will

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			result in no change to the physical fabric of the Listed Buildings, their relationship with their associated garden plots, the adjacent roads, and the fields directly surrounding their plots and the rural context of the setting of the Listed Buildings will be unaffected, resulting in no harm to the assets' significance. - Regarding Morton Manor and Morton Grange, the detailed settings assessment considered, and detailed, elements of the assets' setting which contribute to their significance, which includes elements such as views of the buildings from Morton Lane and the wider rural landscape, highlighting those which contribute to the heritage significance of those assets, including the visibility of the Principal Site in those views. This assessment subsequently informed the assessment of impacts of the Proposed Development upon those assets, also presented within Appendix 7-D, concluding that with the proposed mitigation measures, the appreciation and understanding of the special interest of the Listed Buildings would not be affected (resulting in no harm). - Regarding Hall Close Scheduled Monument, an appropriate understanding of the significance of the asset and contribution made by setting to that significance is presented in Appendix 7-D. It is also highlighted that the sensitivities associated with this asset have informed the layout of the Proposed Development (including the removal of panels from areas immediately adjacent to the Scheduled Monument). The detailed assessment concluded that the Proposed Development will not obscure or impact on the appreciation, understanding or experience of the Scheduled Monument and whilst the solar panels will introduce change to one part of the asset's surroundings, this change will in no way harm its historic, aesthetic and evidential values, or the understanding and appreciation of these values. Consequently, it was concluded that there would be no harm to the significance of this asset and Historic England in their Relevant Representations did not raise any concerns with regard to the Scheduled Hall Close. - Regarding Somerton Castle, clarification was sought during consultation with Historic England regarding the potential effects on designated heritage assets from work within the Cable Corridor, and during a meeting on 31 March 2025, an agreement was reached that there would be no issues on designated heritage assets from construction work along the Cable Corridor (details in the Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**). As discussed in the detailed settings assessment (Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]**), there is no visibility between the assets and the Proposed Development (and distance of c. 2.88km from the nearest proposed solar array). - Regarding Tonge's Farm, the Applicant has presented the assessment of level of harm upon the Listed Building, taking into consideration the asset's heritage significance, its setting, the Proposed Development and mitigation measures, within the detailed settings assessment (Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]**) and is of the opinion that the assessment is proportionate to the asset's significance and development impacts. It should be noted that level of change within the *setting* of an asset does not necessarily translate to the level of overall harm to heritage significance of that asset.
	6	*Cumulative Effects* Assessment of cumulative impacts remains limited and underplays the incremental erosion of rural historic landscape character through multiple solar schemes. The risk is that dispersed historic farmsteads and settlement patterns lose legibility at a landscape scale.	*Cumulative Effects* The Applicant is of the opinion that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the cumulative impacts, as presented within Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** and Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** in line with the EIA Regulations.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
	7	**Transport and Access** The Council in its capacity as Highways Authority has reviewed the application documents for this proposal. LCC has had extensive pre-app discussion regarding this application and the methodology and assessment of the traffic impact, as set out in ES Chapter 13 Traffic and Transport, is generally agreed. The traffic impact on LCC's network would be acceptable provided the mitigation measures included in Section 13.6 are undertaken and delivered. This will be mostly done by the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP). The FCTMP set out outline proposals for site working times, HGV routes, security details, compound car parking, wheel washing, delivery management system, traffic management and monitoring. These will need to be detailed in the detailed CTMP and all these will need to be monitored, controlled and enforceable to ensure safety of the public highway and that the traffic impact is within what has been assessed in the ES. • The FCTMP provides sufficient details at this stage for all proposed access locations (layout, swept paths, visibility splays, radii etc). • The technical and construction details of the accesses will need approving by LCC under its Section 184 Vehicle Access Crossing Procedure. This is acknowledged in 1.3.1 "The **Draft DCO** includes a requirement for the Framework CTMP to be developed into a detailed CTMP that would be submitted for the approval of the relevant authorities before construction commences. The DCO would, therefore, include a Requirement to secure compliance with the measures set out in the detailed CTMP."	Transport and Access The Applicant acknowledges LCC's comments in its capacity as Local Highways Authority and will continue to work collaboratively with LCC in matters relating to Transport and Access as it has done to date. Production of a detailed CTMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CTMP, and the requirement for it to be approved by the relevant authorities (including LCC) before construction commences is secured under Requirement 14 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	8	**Hydrology and Hydrogeology** *Surface Water Flood Risk* The Council in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the application documents for this proposal. The Flood Risk Assessment (ES App 9-C) sets out the assessment and proposed mitigation for surface water flood risk (Section 4.5), with most mitigation being in the form of edge swales. Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy (ES App 9-D) sets out in more detail the outline proposals for the surface water strategy with initial calculations for volumes of attenuation and discharge rates. LCC considers these documents provide suitable assessment at this outline stage of the surface water flood risk and how it will be mitigated by the development. The details of the measures can be approved at the detailed design stage. LCC would expect these mitigation measures to be secured within the dDCO.	Hydrology and Hydrogeology *Surface Water Flood Risk* The Applicant welcomes this response and notes the comments from LCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority. Detail of the SWDS are included within Schedule 2, Requirement 10(1) (Surface and foul water drainage), and the latest version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.
	9	**Landscape and Visual** AAH Consultants, on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and North Kesteven District Council (NKDC), has reviewed the relevant Landscape and Visual elements of the Fosse Green Energy Application to provide initial comment to be incorporated within a Relevant Representation statement from LCC and NKDC. By reason of its mass and scale, we judge that the proposed development would lead to Significant Adverse effects upon the existing landscape and visual baseline, which is reflected within the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).	Landscape and Visual The Applicant acknowledges that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Receptors will be most impacted during the construction phase, and the number of significant effects will drop by half at Year 1 of operation. The significant effects will further reduce as the mitigation planting will be established by Year 15 (a chosen year of assessment to align with industry practices), replacing the vegetation lost at the construction phase, enhancing landscape pattern, and helping integrate the Proposed Development within the surrounding landscape. Specifically, residents of Thorpe on the Hill and Bassingham will experience moderate adverse effects during construction, but are not expected to experience any adverse effects during operation of the Proposed Development. It should be noted that the

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		The development has the potential to transform the local landscape by altering the character on a large scale. This landscape change also has potential to affect wider landscape character, at a regional or county scale, by replacing large areas of agricultural or rural land with solar development, affecting the current openness, tranquillity and agricultural character, that are defining characteristics of the area. We are particularly concerned about the landscape character effects through changes to the land use over an extensive area of agricultural land, as identified in Section 10.7 of the LVIA chapter. The LVIA chapter identifies a "*change in land use and character due to the solar panels and associated equipment introducing structures within an arable landscape*". This should be considered in regards to affecting a vast area of land. Significant landscape effects are subsequently identified within the LVIA chapter with the identification of Significant adverse effects to the Principal Site (the area of the order limits covered by PV panels) and Published Landscape Character Areas, at Construction, Year 1 Operation and Year 15 Operation. Significant Residual landscape effects largely arise from character areas directly affected (where the development is located within these areas). The scale and extent of development would also lead to Significant Adverse effects on views from visual receptors, changing from views experienced within an agricultural or rural landscape to that of a landscape containing large scale solar development. The development has been identified in the LVIA chapter as resulting in a Significant change to a variety of visual receptors at Construction, Year 1 Operation and Year 15 Operation. Significant Residual visual effects largely arise from sensitive users in close proximity to the development where it is not possible to sufficiently screen views of the development. While we acknowledge new planting and habitat creation will add valuable assets across this area, this is through the introduction of a large-scale solar development in an agricultural landscape. The planting, if establishes as predicted, will also go some way in screening and integrating proposals in views. However, we do note that the reduction in Significant landscape and visual effects predominantly relies upon the successful establishment of the planting scheme.	Applicant has sought to further minimise the visual impact of the Proposed Development upon residential receptors in close proximity to the Proposed Development. As reported in the updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 10 of the ES **[AS-117]**), the removal of solar PV in Field 46 adjoining Grange Cottage, and the amendment of proposed landscaping (as set out in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) results in the assessment of visual effects at this property reducing from Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects in Years 1 and 15 (Winter) of operation, and Minor Adverse (Not Significant) in Summer Year 15, to Minor Adverse (Not Significant) at Year 1 Winter, and Negligible Adverse at Year 15 Winter and Summer. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** outlines the landscape and ecology impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Proposed Development, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Proposed Development is operational. When making a decision on the DCO Application, the Secretary of State will need to balance these impacts against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in the energy NPSs. The Applicant notes that a full review of the landscape and visual elements will be provided within the Council's Local Impact Report in due course.
	10	The cumulative landscape and visual effects of the proposed development are considered in Chapter 15 of the ES and Section 10.10 of the LVIA. While a 2km ZoI has been utilised for schemes to be considered for cumulative landscape and visual effects, four large scale solar projects that are located beyond this distance have also been shortlisted to be considered against Fosse Green Energy for cumulative landscape end visual effects, as identified in paragraph 10.10.2: • ID 63. Application Reference: EN010149. Springwell Energy Farm. • ID 87. Application Reference: EN010162. Great North Road Solar • ID 88. Application Reference: EN010159. One Earth Solar Farm. • ID 103. Application Reference: EN0110016. Leoda Solar Farm Of the projects listed within paragraph 10.10.1 and 10.10.2 to be considered in the cumulative assessment, Significant cumulative landscape and visual effects judged to be limited to the scheme and:	<u>Cumulative Effects</u> The approach to assessing cumulative landscape and visual effects is consistent with PINS Guidance on Cumulative Effects and follows a proportionate methodology as outlined in GLVIA3[12]. The cumulative assessment contained in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** primarily focusses on the cumulative schemes within the 2km ZoI, as this was judged to be the geographic area across which landscape and visual effects were most likely to occur, although the nearest NSIP scale solar schemes beyond 2km were also scoped in given their similar scale and typology to the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These found that given the

[12] Landscape Institute and IEMA (2013). Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		• ID 95. Application Reference: PL/0087/23. North Hykeham Relief Road: Significant landscape and visual effects are identified in the LVIA; • ID 63. Application Reference: EN010149. Springwell Energy Farm: Significant landscape and visual effects are identified in the LVIA; • ID 103. Application Reference: EN0110016. Leoda Solar Farm: Significant landscape and visual effects are identified in the LVIA. Due to the extent and proximity of additional NSIP scale solar schemes in the area, we would suggest the examination is utilised to explore the potential for Significant effects from these additional schemes, above those identified in the LVIA. These large-scale solar schemes occupy some of the same landscape character areas as Fosse Green Energy Solar. The mass and scale of these projects combined has the potential to lead to adverse effects on landscape character over an extensive area, across the region, which may be completely altered over the operational period, particularly when experienced sequentially for visual receptors travelling through the landscape and experiencing these schemes across potentially several kilometres, albeit with gaps between schemes. These schemes combined, if built, would clearly require the update of any published landscape character assessment, including the NCA's, so as to include large scale solar as a defining land use characteristic as well as agriculture. The Fosse Green Energy scheme would evidently deliver landscape and ecological improvements through mitigation areas and planting. However, this will be dependent upon the information set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (shown on Figure 7.15-1 Landscape Mitigation plan within the OLEMP at Appendix A) which illustrates the mitigation, which should be further explored, and would need to be refined at the detailed design stages. The DCO should include for approval of any subsequent detailed landscape and ecological mitigation scheme (planting works), as referenced in Schedule 2 of the DCO. This should clearly link to any landscape mitigation that is submitted as part of the scheme, and subsequently that which has been assessed as part of the LVIA. This should not just be a management plan, but a detailed landscape scheme clearly identifying plant species, numbers and specifications along with planting details. The DCO should also include for an appropriate period of landscape maintenance, currently referenced at article 30(8), that ties into a period of time identified in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, and would expect an initial 15-year period of management and maintenance as a minimum, which would align with the assessed residual landscape and visual effects. This would subsequently be regularly reviewed and monitored at a reasonable period, such as every 3 to 5 years and implemented for the lifetime of the project. This should include for a reasonable plant replacement program, such as following a significant loss or failure to thrive, to ensure the planting scheme meets the aims and objectives laid out in the submission. Proposed vegetation removal is identified within the Draft DCO and Appendix 10-H Arboricultural Impact Assessment. 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. This should clearly relate to vegetation removal plans and AIA, and this must also include vegetation removal or works to facilitate wider highways and access works, such as for abnormal loads.	notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. It is therefore the Applicant's view that the previous examination reports further support the conclusion that significant cumulative effects on landscape and visual receptors resulting from the Proposed Development and other schemes beyond the 2km ZoI are unlikely. <u>Management and Maintenance</u> Section 7 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** secures the need to monitor and review the management prescriptions undertaken. This includes for walkover surveys of the Order Limits to be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. The extent of vegetation clearance is shown on the Maximum Vegetation Removal Plan provided at Figure 3-17 of the ES **[AS-029]**. This corresponds with the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** which commits to removing trees and hedgerows only where access is required and where using existing gaps in hedgerows or trees is not considered practical. The implementation of a detailed LEMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, including vegetation removal requires approval under Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** includes LCC as a prescribed consultee in respect of the final LEMP.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
	11	**Biodiversity** APP-033 (6.1 Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation) sets out the biodiversity and ecological elements of the Applicant's Environmental Statement. A broad suite of ecological surveys and investigations have been undertaken by the Applicant. The results of these surveys have been used to inform the Environmental Statement for the project and to be used in the development of any necessary mitigation measures. Surveys undertaken include: • Habitat and botanical surveys including both terrestrial and aquatic habitats. • Detailed surveys for protected and notable species, including great crested newts, reptiles, amphibians, breeding and wintering birds, bats, riparian mammals and terrestrial invertebrates. APP-033 identifies a range of potential ecological effects during the construction of the proposal. These include permanent loss or change of habitats, temporary loss or damage to habitats, impacts on protected and priority species ranging from disturbance to direct mortality. The potential for inadvertently encouraging the spread of invasive non-native species (INNS) is also considered and a commitment to the development of a Biosecurity Management Plan is included in the Framework CEMP (APP-189). During operations and maintenance, the main potential effect is likely to be disturbance of protected and priority species. Decommissioning impacts are predicted to be similar to construction impacts including disturbance and temporary loss of habitats. The Project is reliant on a package of avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures to address the ecological impacts. To this end, the Applicant has prepared a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-189), a Framework Operational Environmental Management Pan (OEMP) (APP-190), a Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (AS-101) and a Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) (APP-191). Measures proposed in the Framework CEMP, LEMP and DEMP will need to be secured in the DCO. A Commitments Register (APP-183) has been prepared which provides a helpful summary of the how mitigation identified for the Project including embedded and additional mitigation measures are secured.	Biodiversity The Applicant notes that LCC are satisfied with the ecological surveys and investigations conducted to support the assessment provided in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** of the ES. Similarly, LCC are satisfied with the content of the below management plans, which will be secured via the relevant Requirements in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**: - Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** secured in Requirement 12; - Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** secured in Requirement 13; - Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** secured in Requirement 8; and - Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** secured in Requirement 20.
	12	Impacts on statutory and non-statutory designated sites The Applicant has undertaken desk studies and a search of information held by Lincolnshire Ecological Records Centre to identify important ecological sites in the vicinity of the proposal. There are no internationally important sites designated for biodiversity within 10km of the proposal and two nationally important sites designated for biodiversity within 5km of the Order limits. The location of these sites is shown in AS-042. A Habitats Regulation Assessment report (APP-181) has been prepared which concludes that there will be no adverse effects on any designated sites or their features. The Council has no reason to disagree with this conclusion; however, The Planning Inspectorate will need to satisfy itself that sufficient information has been submitted by the Applicant to enable this conclusion to be reached.	Impacts on statutory and non-statutory designated sites The Applicant notes that LCC are satisfied with the assessment provided in both Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation **[APP-033]** of the ES and the Habitats Regulation Assessment **[APP-181]**. These assessments conclude that there will be no adverse effects on any designated site or their features, nor on any non-statutory sites designated for biodiversity importance with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		There are 29 non-statutory sites designated for biodiversity importance either within or within 2km of the Order limits. The locations of these non-statutory sites are set out in AS043. When proposed mitigation measures are taken into account, no significant effects on these sites are predicted.	
	13	Cumulative Effects There are a number of development proposals of varying scales in the vicinity of this proposal. These range from small scale housing developments to NSIP scale energy developments. Details of the approach to cumulative effects are presented in APP-040 and section 8.15 of APP-033. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant adverse effects on ecology arising from cumulative impacts. Given the number of solar developments of varying scales in the County, the Council is concerned about the potential for cumulative impacts on populations of ground nesting birds such as skylark.	Cumulative Effects An assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on birds is presented in Table 8-14 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**, with Section 8.12 of Chapter 8 setting out specific mitigation requirements for ground nesting birds such as skylark and lapwing. With these measures in place Table 8-16 of Chapter 8 concludes that no significant effects on ground-nesting birds (or other birds) will arise as a result of the Proposed Development. Specific habitat creation and management for ground-nesting, as well as other bird species, is set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured via Requirement 8 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The extent and type of mitigation provided by the Proposed Development has been informed by the detailed ornithological surveys undertaken by the Applicant, as detailed in Appendix 8-G: Breeding Birds of the ES **[AS-086]** and Appendix 8-H: Non-breeding birds of the ES **[AS-087]** of the ES and summarised in Table 8-13 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. The mitigation provision for ground-nesting birds consists of 64ha (158.1 acres) of permanent grassland and a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable. These areas are indicatively illustrated as Arable fields A to F on Figure 8-5: Bird Mitigation Land Allocation of the ES **[AS-046]** but could be rotated within the areas of the Order Limits where there is no solar PV infrastructure, providing the principles for field sizes are achieved. The mitigation is secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. The nature of the bird mitigation land was discussed with the County Ecologist and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) on 23 January 2025 and in follow up emails. LCC responded in writing confirming its acceptance of the proposals for bird mitigation land. Table 8-19 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** of the ES states *"Where cumulative developments are predicted to have adverse effects on the same ground-nesting bird species as that present within the DCO Site, appropriate mitigation measures are included within respective developments, to ensure there are no significant residual effects."* In adherence with legislation and policy it is reasonable to assume that cumulative schemes proposed in the locality provide suitable mitigation measures to reduce or offset impacts on ground-nesting birds. These measures, in combination with the measures secured by the DCO for the Proposed Development, are considered sufficient to mitigate any cumulative effects of the Proposed Development with respect to ground nesting birds.
	14	Biodiversity Net Gain The Applicant has set out their approach to BNG in APP-194. Given the scale and nature of the proposed development The Council will expect the project to deliver significantly more than 10%	Biodiversity Net Gain The approach outlined regarding assigning Strategic Significance in the comments from the Council does not follow the guidance outlined in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Based on current calculations the Proposed Development is predicted to result in a net gain of 30.64% for area habitat units, 50.62% for hedgerow units, and 11.83% for watercourse units. The Council welcomes this level of BNG delivery however there are some areas of the Applicant's BNG assessment that require additional information or clarification. The Council considers that changes are required to elements of the baseline biodiversity calculations specifically in relation to the assessment of Strategic Significance. Strategic Significance has not been applied in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric user guide. The Statutory Biodiversity Metric user guide states that where Local Authorities have identified criteria for assessing strategic significance, the medium strategic significance category (Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy) in the metric should not be used. Given that North Kesteven District Council has identified criteria (Central Lincolnshire Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping) for assessing Strategic Significance, the metric should be updated to reflect this with areas previously being assigned medium strategic significance being assessed as either significant or not. This will affect the baseline biodiversity value calculations. The Applicant should also review the areas assigned to habitat parcels in the metric as a number of these have been assigned an area of 0ha. If a habitat parcel is included with the proposed DCO boundary, it should be assigned an accurate area in the metric and included in the calculations. The Council notes that the Trading Rules in the metric are not currently being met. This is due to the loss of 'Lakes – Reservoirs', 'Heathland and shrub – Mixed scrub' and 'Cropland – Arable field margins' habitats, which have not been directly mitigated for by the Proposed Development. The Council advises that the Applicant should seek to meet the trading rules by creating additional areas of high distinctiveness habitat. The Council welcomes the Applicant's commitment to delivering BNG and considers that these commitments will need to be secured in the DCO. The Applicant will also need to demonstrate that the commitments made to delivering BNG are achievable via the final LEMP. The Council encourages the Applicant to work with other developers and stakeholders in the area to identify opportunities to deliver BNG strategically and welcomes ongoing engagement with the Applicant in relation to ecology and BNG. Further detailed comments on ecology and BNG will be provided in the LIR.	These methods of assigning Strategic Significance only apply when there is a published Local Nature Recovery Strategy for that area. As none exists yet, methodology outlined in Table 8 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide has been used in Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**. Section 3.1.4. of the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** outlines the methodology used, which is further justified in Appendix E. Any distinct habitat area below the minimum mapping unit, in line with UKHab survey methodology, for this project was not to be included within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric associated with the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** and have therefore been allocated a 0 ha size measurement. As this is a DCO application it is therefore not subject to mandatory BNG legislation and satisfaction of the Trading Rules is not a requirement. However, as described in Paragraphs 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 of the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** it is considered that either the impact to these habitats will be avoided at detailed design stage or sufficient alternatives have been provided. The Applicant's commitment to deliver a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4) for the Proposed Development is secured by Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This requires a detailed LEMP to be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority prior to commencement of the authorised development, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, including details of how the plan will contribute to the achievement of the above mentioned minimum percentages during operation. The approved detailed LEMP must be implemented as approved throughout operation of the authorised development. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** includes detail on the relevant management/monitoring regimes to deliver BNG targets and monitor landscaping and ecological enhancements, which will be implemented as part of the detailed LEMP. The following is secured within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.7) which will be carried through into the detailed LEMP: "*A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP. Walkover surveys of the DCO Site will be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. This monitoring will also be used for the purposes of BNG Condition Assessments that requires a 30-year management plan*."
	15	**Land and Soils** The potential impacts on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land in respect of this scheme and cumulatively with other projects that are emerging/known about in Lincolnshire are of concern to the Council. The Council will seek to protect high quality agricultural land in Lincolnshire (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) from development in accordance with its Energy Infrastructure Position Statement adopted 5 December 2023. https://lincolnshire.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s60096/Energy%20Infrastructure%20Position.pdf	Land and Soils The Applicant has sought to avoid the use of BMV land and minimise impacts on BMV land (and ongoing agricultural operations). BMV agricultural land has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		Lincolnshire has the largest combinable crop output of any UK county, with about 12% of England's arable crop area. Its combination of climate, soil type and topography make the county ideal for a variety of crops with 437,591 ha of land given over to agriculture and horticulture in Lincolnshire, and producing by value circa 10% percent of England's cereal, 25% of vegetables and 14% of industrial crops (sugar beet, oil seed rape and protein crops). This has led to the area having the UK's leading concentration of fresh produce processors, traders and technology suppliers. This high level of production is vital to the county's economy, with a total crop output of over £1,564 million and a total livestock output of £555 million in 2023. To preserve fresh produce and minimise supply chain distance, highly productive food hubs have built up in the south of the county. The importance of this sector for the local economy is reflected in the number of jobs it generates with an agricultural workforce of 12,000. The overall Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) findings for the Fosse Geen proposal are set out in the ES Chapter 12: Socio Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**. Paragraph 12.5.11 identifies that 'The land is predominantly Subgrade 3b (moderate quality agricultural land) with the remainder BMV land of Subgrade 3a (good quality agricultural land), with some non-agricultural land. No areas of ALC Grade 1 or 2 have been identified within the Principal Site'. Figure 12.5 presents the data from the survey report. Whilst the loss of BMV land used for solar panels is considered 'temporary', 60 years is however a long period and there is also the potential for land to be permanently lost to habitat and mitigation. The potential impacts on agricultural land both in respect of this scheme and cumulatively with other NSIP solar projects that are consented and emerging in Lincolnshire will be raised in the LIR and written submissions.	developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.7.44), the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent. The Applicant is applying for consent for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational life of the Proposed Development, the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. With regards to consideration of the economic and other benefits of BMV land, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** has considered this as part of the assessment undertaken, for example with regards to consideration of the existing jobs supported by the agricultural land. As noted in paragraph 12.7.52 of this chapter, it has been confirmed by all landowners that there is expected to be no job losses resulting from the removal of agricultural land, as it is expected that when the rent revenues from the land start, there will be additional jobs created on their farms offsite as landowners diversify their land further with the underlying financial stability of the rental income. With regards to consideration of the potential cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Development in combination with other solar farm proposals in the area, cumulative effects and interactions between the Proposed Development and other solar NSIPs are assessed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. The short list of cumulative developments, inclusive of the relevant solar proposals in the area, has been agreed with NKDC and LCC. The agreed short list of cumulative developments is provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. The Applicant notes that further detailed comments on the potential cumulative impacts will be provided within LCC's Local Impact Report and written submissions as necessary.
	16	**Socio-economics** The Council has reviewed the ES Chapter 12: Socio Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]** and has the following comments at this stage. Further detailed comments will be provided in the LIR and written representations as necessary. <u>Employment and Skills</u> As the scheme progresses and should it be successful in its DCO application, efforts to maximise local employment should be taken. We recommend ongoing dialogue with local skills	Socio-economics The Applicant notes that further detailed comments will be provided within the Council's Local Impact Report and written representations as necessary. <u>Employment and Skills</u> The Applicant notes this comment. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**, submitted as part of the DCO Application, would, once implemented in full post-consent, deliver positive outcomes in terms of employment. This includes the Applicant seeking to maximise opportunities for investing in skills locally, local supply chain and businesses that can support the construction and operation of the Proposed Development and other solar projects in the area. With specific regard to maximising local employment, the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** identifies the following

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		providers, both public and voluntary sector providers. These may include: Lincoln College, The Abby Access Centre, and LCC Employment and Skills team. Temporary Workforce 330 peak workers are expected to require accommodation near to the proposed development during construction. While the impact on tourist accommodation is considered, there appears to be no consideration of impacts from the 'influx of workers' (NPS EN1 paragraph 5.13.4 sixth bullet point). Thus, the applicant ignores change to 'local population dynamics', 'demand for services and facilities in the settlements nearest to the construction work', and 'social cohesion' (also at paragraph 5.13.4 of EN1). Although there appears to be no consideration of travel arrangements and need for accommodation in decommissioning, there is expected to be the same number of jobs (table 12-23 and 12-28) as in construction so there is similar potential for an influx of workers and related impacts. Visitor Economy LCC are extremely concerned with the visual degradation of the countryside and the consequential impact on the visitor economy which is worth £2.9bn to Lincolnshire. Visitors come to Lincolnshire for its rurality and unspoilt countryside, our landscape, visitor economy attractions and places of interest. Villages to the east of the application site are situated on the ridge of Jurassic limestone on the Lincoln Cliff Edge overlooking the application site. Within these villages there are visitor attractions such as Mrs Smith's Cottage www.mrssmithscottage.com in Navenby that are continually frequented by school parties, residents, visitors, foreign visitors, UK visitors, aviation heritage, historians, cyclists and others. There is also the Knight Templar circular route which encompasses the Temple Bruer Knight Templar Preceptory Tower in Temple Brewer, RAF Wellingore historical site, the roman settlement remains on Ermine Street Navenby and bustling villages consisting of thriving businesses: traditional bakers, tearooms, cafes, florist, public houses, schools, doctors, community venues and others. These are villages that warmly welcome visitors and will enhance their stay. Walkers will still seek to use the PROW network and do so via the Viking Way (along the Cliff) to explore these beautiful villages. The development of a solar farm close to these village and residents' houses will adversely impact on the visitor economy offer and severely the economic returns of the vibrant high streets. Overall, the proposals are an industrialisation of that countryside and will negatively affect our visitor offer and economic vibrancy and change the visual impact/beauty of these villages.	potential activity theme, 'Theme 2 – Access to Employment', at Section 3.3, which refers to this and proposed engagement with providers as follows: *"The Applicant would investigate measures to promote take up of jobs generated by the Scheme by local people. The starting point will be engagement with Local Authorities and Job Centre Plus, in order to tap into existing local employment support networks."* Temporary Workforce Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land use of the ES **[AS-016]** includes an assessment of potential effects on tourist/visitor accommodation (ref. Section 12.7), which the Applicant considers to be the principal potential impact arising from an influx of workers during the construction and decommissioning phases. The other considerations highlighted by the LCC are not expected to result in adverse significant effects during construction or decommissioning. The reasons for this for each in-turn are as follows. • Local population dynamics: the construction period is expected to take 24 months or to be phased over 30 months, with decommissioning being completed over a shorter period of 12 to 24 months. Given the short durations of these periods, no workers would move permanently to the local area such as to have any potential to exert influence on local population dynamics. • Demand for services and facilities in the settlements nearest to the construction work: the assessment of impact on tourist accommodation has considered all accommodation within a 60 minute drive time study area from the Order Limits. Accommodation in the immediately surrounding area is typically small in size, reflecting its countryside nature. Whilst worker accommodation and travel arrangements will be the choice of the construction/decommissioning contractor, it is expected that for cost-efficiency, and to minimise trips and impacts on the road network, larger hotels/accommodation would be used which are typically found closer to the larger centres of population such as Lincoln, Newark-on-Trent and Grantham. The number of workers staying locally would be minimised through this. When on-site, workers would not be able to access primary healthcare facilities in the vicinity of the Proposed Development, with any emergency treatment where needed being provided at the nearest hospital with an Accident and Emergency unit, Lincoln County Hospital. Therefore, no significant effects on service provision such as local primary healthcare would be expected to arise. • Social cohesion: taking together the overall short-term durations of the construction and decommissioning periods, the likely locations of worker accommodation being within larger centres of population and the minimal impact on demand for services and facilities expected arising from this, there would be no significant effects on social cohesion from the Proposed Development. In respect of impacts on visitor accommodation specifically during decommissioning, no assessment has been undertaken in Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land-use of the ES **[AS-016]** due to the limitations of estimating baseline provision of accommodation in the future. The assessment approach taken by the Applicant here is consistent with other consented solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire, including Gate Burton Energy Park DCO and Tillbridge Solar Project DCO. Notwithstanding this, it is expected that worker requirements would be the same or lower than construction during decommissioning. As there is no evidence to doubt that rates of spare capacity in the market-led hotels/inns/B&Bs accommodation sector would be greatly different to service general demand, the same or a lower level of demand for accommodation would very

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			likely still be met year-round. On this basis it can be considered that there would be no likely significant effect on the visitor accommodation sector during decommissioning. Visitor Economy: Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land use of the ES **[AS-016]** includes an assessment of potential effects on tourism/recreation arising from the Proposed Development (ref. Section 12.7) comprising consideration of impacts on local accommodation facilities, recreational receptors and visitor attractions. Section 12.5 identifies the size of the visitor economy and recognises that the villages of Coleby, Bassingham, Navenby and Aubourn contain visitor and recreational attractions, and that there is also a network of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) in the surrounding area which may be used by visitors. With due consideration given to other assessment findings set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]**, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-APP-038]** and Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics (Section 14.2: Air Quality) **[APP-039]** as appropriate, the assessment in Section 12.7 concludes that overall the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism/recreation receptors is not significant during the construction/ decommissioning and operational phases. In respect of views from/for these receptors specifically, a Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** has been prepared to accompany the DCO application to provide visual mitigation. Section 12.7 of Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land use of the ES **[AS-016]** also includes an assessment of potential effects on businesses arising from the Proposed Development. Taking into account the assessment findings presented in the ES Chapters set out above this assessment concludes that there would be no significant effect on local businesses during the construction/ decommissioning and operational phases.
	17	**Public Health** LCC notes that there is no human health chapter or section in the Environmental Statement, which makes assessing the impact on the population difficult. Indeed, the Technical Summary barely mentions health or wellbeing. The Principal Site covers a large area (1,070 hectares) with fields of Solar PV arrays distributed over the site plus a 10km cable corridor route to the proposed substation at Navenby. Some Solar PV arrays and surrounding fencing seem unnecessarily close to the built-up areas of Bassingham, Thorpe on the Hill, and Witham St Hughs and will have a significant impact on the landscape and visuals, and so potentially long-term mental health. Public Health would like the Examining Authority to require the Developer to produce a mental health impact assessment for the potential impacts to be properly considered. LCC notes the assessment of Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) and conclusion that there would be no significant impact, with levels below those recommended by the International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). The assessment does not appear to have included battery storage, however, the extent to which these emit ionizing EMFs is not known. Other potential health impacts from battery storage, such as fire risk, must also be considered and mitigated with control, containment, and extinguishing provision to the satisfaction of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue. Cumulative impacts (Chapter 15) do not appear to have covered EMFs from other electricity generation, transmission, or storage infrastructure in the area, including where the cable feeds into the substation at Navenby.	Public Health Human Health It is acknowledged that energy infrastructure has the potential to impact on the health and well-being of the population and therefore, potential effects on human health are considered as part of the EIA process. Section 6.2 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** considers the effects of the Proposed Development on human health in the context of planning policy. At the point of scoping the EIA, the Applicant proposed to proportionately consider the potential effects on human health within individual EIA technical assessments. This is set out in Table 17-1 (Scope of Technical Topics and Elements to be Scoped Out) of the EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1-A: EIA Scoping Report **[APP-118]**), where it is stated that a standalone assessment of human health is not proposed, whereby human health would be considered within the assessments of technical chapters of the EIA, namely: • Landscape and visual; • Noise and vibration; • Traffic and transport; and • Air quality. With regards to human health, the Scoping Opinion provided at Appendix 1-B of the ES **[APP-119]** (ref. ID 3.8.5) notes: "*The Inspectorate notes that a standalone human health assessment is proposed to be scoped out of the assessment, noting that matters relating to human health*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		Public Health is satisfied with the assessments on noise and air quality; however, it leaves these matters to the Environmental Health team of North Kesteven District Council. There are some proposed mitigation measures that would help improve health and wellbeing outcomes should the DCO be granted and the development go ahead, which includes the provision of permissive paths, new planting and potential for grazing underneath panels. Overall, it is felt there would need to be further community gain (e.g., greater access to public open space, play provision, other community asset enhancements and/or a community fund) should the development go ahead. Furter comments will be provided in the LIR.	*would be covered within the landscape and visual, noise and vibration, traffic and transport and air quality assessments in the ES. The Inspectorate notes the potential for a 400kV overhead line being proposed as part of the Proposed Development. Where this option is progressed within the ES, it should demonstrate the potential for significant effects on human health during operation, construction and decommissioning. Providing such a justification is present, the Inspectorate is content that a standalone ES chapter for Human Health is not required and agrees that this aspect can be scoped out. The ES should ensure sufficient clarification and cross referencing is present. Consideration should be given to direct and indirect impacts on human health receptors. The assessment should be informed by relevant guidance such as the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) 2022 guidance 'Determining Significance for Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment'.* Furthermore, the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 1-B of the ES **[APP-119]** (ref. ID 3.8.14)) notes: *"The Scoping Report indicates that the electricity to be generated by the Proposed Development is expected to be exported via a 400kV connection either underground or overhead to a new National Grid substation. Where a 400kV overhead line option is progressed, the ES should consider the potential for effects on human health from possible EMF, taking into account relevant guidance, where significant effects are likely to occur."* It should be noted that the 400kV overhead line option was discounted following the EIA Scoping stage, and as such the potential effects associated with this option were not considered within the ES. The Scoping Opinion also incorporates the response from NKDC (NKDC) as a relevant statutory consultee who were also in agreement with the approach: "*We agree that effects to human health as a result of the proposed development can be scoped out as long as reference is made where applicable through the findings of other assessments undertaken as part of the EIA process*." In respect of the technical topic assessments themselves, the scope and assessment methodology for each of these, including as relevant to the consideration of human health impacts relevant to a given topic, was also agreed via the EIA Scoping process. This included input and consideration of comments and requirements from local planning authorities and relevant statutory bodies. As such, it was ultimately agreed that incorporating such human health matters across the ES chapters was a proportionate and suitable methodology. In line with the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 1-B: EIA Scoping Opinion of the ES **[APP-199]**), Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]** provides sufficient clarification, setting out (ref. paragraph 5.1.11) that potential effects to human health are considered within the relevant ES technical chapters, with a standalone assessment scoped out of the EIA, and cross references to the ES chapters where potential effects to human health are considered. This notes the following ES chapters: • Chapter 9: Water Environment **[APP-034]**; • Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**; • Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]**; • Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]**; and • Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics, Section 14.2: Air Quality **[APP-039]**. In line with the methodology set out in Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]** (ref. paragraph 5.9.12), and within the impact assessment methodology for each of the technical chapters as relevant, consideration is inherently given to human health receptors where relevant

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			within each of the technical assessments. For example, noise and vibration, air quality and EMF assessments consider the potential for direct effects upon human receptors, and each of these have specific health limits/thresholds set for the protection of the sensitive members of the population. Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]** considers the potential impacts upon PRoW and permissive paths, which are used for recreational purposes and therefore have an inherent health benefit, as well as a wellbeing aspect. The assessment also inherently considers the potential impact upon people, for example relating to congestion (driver delay), community severance, and fear and intimidation on the roads, which by their nature also affect stress and wellbeing, and therefore people's health. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]** presents the findings of an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon landscape character and visual amenity. Whilst this chapter does not specifically assess the effects on human health, the assessment considers the potential impacts upon the community and people, for example with regards to how the Proposed Development has the potential to affect their views and appreciation of the landscape. The Applicant recognises that some communities on other solar projects have highlighted that the visibility of solar farms will cause stress and wellbeing issues, with the LVIA focussed on assessing the severity of the change on visual amenity and landscape. With sufficient screening in place (as secured by the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) and good design, a solar farm should not impact a community's health or well-being. The LVIA also assessed the impact on views from PRoW, which is a recreational receptor that some users enjoy as part of stress-relief and exercise, and therefore considers where potential impacts have the potential to directly affect health. The water environment assessment considers human health with regards to the assessment of water quality (including its importance both for ecological receptors and human population), as well as consideration of flood risk, which inherently concerns the potential risk to local human receptors. With regards to potential health impacts associated with the BESS, such as fire risk, as set out within the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, (ref. paragraph 2.3.5) the centralised BESS and distributed BESS will be located a minimum of 200m and 150m respectively from the closest residential receptors, which will mitigate any potential significant effects on nearby receptors in the unlikely event of a fire - Appendix 14-G Unplanned Emissions Assessment of the ES **[APP-176]** assesses the impact of airborne chemicals and gases produced in the event of a BESS fire and shows that the dilution of gases and the distance from the BESS is sufficient to avoid any exceedances of airborne gas safety levels. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is a key document produced as part of the DCO application that addresses the safety measures proposed for the BESS, which has been developed in close coordination with the LFRS. The detailed BSMP will be developed in accordance with Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which requires that the chosen BESS work (i.e. Work No. 2 or Work No. 3) must not commence until a BSMP has been submitted to and approved by LCC, in consultation with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and the Environment Agency. Requirement 7 also provides that the detailed BSMP must be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			In conclusion, the Applicant considers that the potential impacts upon human health have been appropriately assessed within the ES, and in line with the Scoping Opinion, with appropriate mitigation developed and secured via the management plans submitted with the DCO. <u>Mental Health</u> Regarding mental health, the Applicant recognises that elements of the Proposed Development have the potential to affect mental health. To address such concerns and support the long-term wellbeing of the community, including mental health, the Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to minimise impacts on health and wellbeing through undertaking a comprehensive and robust Environmental Impact Assessment and consultation process to identify and implement beneficial design opportunities. In terms of disruption during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases, measures set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**, Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** and Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** will reduce or avoid mental health related impacts. These include measures such as new planting to screen views and by reducing the amount of solar PV in Field 46 to avoid a significant visual effect from any residential dwellings during the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. Once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, which can have a quality of life benefit for users through improving access to recreation. The framework management plans noted above are to be developed into detailed management plans, substantially in accordance with the respective frameworks, as secured under Requirements 12, 13, 20 and 8, respectively, of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that LCC are a named consultee on these Requirements, and as such will have the opportunity to review the detailed management plans prior to any approval. Furthermore, a Community Liaison Group is secured through Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which requires the establishment of a community liaison group prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development. Such a group has already been established by the Applicant and will continue during construction and operation. This group provides an opportunity for the local community to engage with the Applicant, learn about the detailed design post consent, express concerns, and be kept up to date. It is expected on this basis that the group will play an important role in helping to reduce/minimise stress. The Applicant is also proposing a community benefit fund, the intention of which is that this will be delivered in cooperation with local community foundations and NKDC to benefit causes chosen by the local community. The community benefit fund delivered alongside the Proposed Development will provide a sum of £400 per MW of export capacity per year. The Applicant is exploring how this could best be managed. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development are best placed to determine what a community benefit would be, and should be able to benefit from funding towards improvements to existing community facilities, such as village halls and sports facilities, provision of electrical vehicle charging points, subsidised solar PV panels for community use and lower cost energy, grants for broadband and wider improvements, educational visits and wider education/apprenticeship opportunities. Considering the above the Applicant does not consider it necessary to produce a mental health impact assessment.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
			EMF The potential impact of Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) generated by the centralised BESS will not be significant as it will be located approximately 300m (note a minimum commitment of 200m) from the nearest residential receptor. Due to the distance, it is considered that EMF field strength will fall below the ICNIRP reference level at all residential receptors. The positioning of ancillary infrastructure, such as for the locations of inverters, transformers and other sources of EMF, have also been considered so they are at safe distances. With regards to the potential for cumulative EMF impacts, it is expected that the potential EMF associated with other relevant developments included within the cumulative developments shortlist (as discussed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**) would have no significant effect on receptors given they would be required to adhere to the same relevant Government policy as set out above to ensure all EMF is below the relevant exposure limits. Furthermore, the nearest residential receptor to the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby is located approximately 600m to the west. Given this distance, it is anticipated that any cumulative EMF from the substation, along with 400kV cabling from projects connecting to it, would be suitably attenuated. Therefore, no cumulative effects are expected due to EMFs.
	18	**Fire Safety** In recognition of the emerging technology of Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and the challenges this poses to Fire and Rescue Services the National Fire Chiefs Council circulated a letter to all Chief Fire Officers on the 22 August 2023 drawing attention to the updating of Renewable and low carbon energy Planning Policy Guidance that was updated in August 2023 by the former Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to include reference to BESS. This planning policy guidance encourages planning authorities to consult with their local Fire and Rescue Service as part of formal planning consultations and directing developers to the National Fire Chiefs Council guidance on BESS schemes. From the discussion with the Lincolnshire Fire Service (LFR) who have developed standing advice for BESS based on national guidance a program of monitoring and risk assessment has been identified which will be necessary once the BESS has been established to ensure it complies with the Outline Battery Management Safety Plan and Emergency Response Plan. During the first year of operation this will involve 21 days of work for the Fire Service and then two days in each subsequent year for the lifetime of the development. The need for this monitoring and assessment will enable early engagement to ensure the required standards are being complied with; to ensure the BESS is constructed to the correct standards with support from the Fire Service; early development of emergency response plans; familiarisations of the BESS for local fire crews and overview by the Fire Service; development of on-going maintenance and updating risk information; and assurance for local residents and communities that the BESS are being independently inspected and monitored to reduce the risk of a fire.	Fire Safety The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is a key document produced as part of the DCO application that addresses the safety measures proposed for the BESS. The detailed BSMP will be developed in accordance with Requirement 7 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which requires that the chosen BESS work (i.e. Work No. 2 or Work No. 3) must not commence until a BSMP has been submitted to and approved by LCC, in consultation with LFRS and the Environment Agency. Requirement 7 also provides that the detailed BSMP must be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. The Applicant and LFRS have agreed protective provisions to be included in the DCO for the benefit of LFRS. The insertion of these protective provisions is reflected in the updated version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which is to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The outcomes of consultations with LFRS are summarised within the SoCG between the Applicant and LCC (which includes LFRS), which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		To enable the Fire and Rescue Service to undertake the necessary monitoring to ensure the BESS is in accordance with the relevant requirement 7, a financial contribution is required via a Protective Provision within the DCO to the Fire Service so that it has sufficient resources in places to undertake monitoring of the BESS connected to this project. This approach has been agreed as part of the recently approved Gate Burton, West Burton and Cottam DCOs and therefore there is a precedent for this approach to be followed for this application. From review of the **Draft DCO** Schedule 14 **[APP-016]** it does not appear that a Protective Provision is proposed for LFR, LCC would wish for this to be included. Appendix A provides a list of LFR requirements relating to access for fire appliances and firefighting water supplies and requirements for Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). The applicant has actively engaged with the LFR throughout the pre-application, any further comments will be provided in the LIR. LFR service wish to continue to be engaged, and their views sought during the examination and through the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG).	
	19	**Cumulative Effects** Lincolnshire is currently experiencing an unprecedented influx of NSIP proposals, with many either recently granted consent or advancing through examination or pre-application stages. This includes 13 large-scale solar development proposals, 6 of which have recently received consent. The Council is particularly concerned about the cumulative impacts of these developments, especially regarding the effects on BMV land, landscape character at local, regional, and national levels, the highway network, waste generation, and amenity-related impacts from overlapping construction periods. The Council will make further comments on the applicant's assessment of cumulative effects and on the potential cumulative impact of the development with other developments including NSIP proposals in the LIR and in written representations and update as necessary as further information on other projects comes forward throughout the examination.	<u>Cumulative Effects</u> Cumulative effects and interactions between the Proposed Development and other solar NSIPs are assessed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. Springwell Solar Farm (cumulative scheme ID 63) and the proposed BESS to the north of Green Man Road (cumulative scheme ID 86) have been considered within the cumulative effects assessment. It is estimated that the solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire, together with the Proposed Development, account for approximately 1.4% of the BMV land in the County of Lincolnshire. Whilst there is a degree of uncertainty around this proportion (based upon available data and associated limitations of study) it is indicative that the solar NSIPs represent a small proportion of BMV land in the County. All of these developments will be reversible and the land is projected to be returned to agriculture on decommissioning, except for relatively small areas used for habitat creation, such as woodland planting, which is anticipated to be retained, and no significant effects on agricultural land were identified for any of the solar NSIPs identified in Section 12.10 Cumulative Assessment of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**.
	20	**Draft Development Consent Order** At this stage the Council wishes to reserves its position on the relevant parts of the **Draft DCO** including the proposed requirements which are likely to be needed, to be amended or added to as the examination progresses. The Council will review the **Draft DCO** to ensure that the Council's role is sufficiently recognised as a discharging authority in relation to relevant requirements and that the Council's role as Highway Authority is appropriately referenced within the **Draft DCO** in relation to any proposed highway works or traffic regulation measures. The Council wishes to participate in any Issue Specific Hearing in relation to the drafting of the DCO.	The Applicant notes that the Council wishes to participate in any Issue Specific Hearing in relation to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and remains committed to maintaining an open dialogue and engaging with the Council throughout, as it has done to date.
	21	**Appendix A – LFR Requirements** <u>Access</u>	Appendix A – LFR Requirements <u>Access</u>

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		21. Access to buildings for fire appliances and fire fighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations 2010 Part B5. For small buildings (up to 2000m², with a top occupied storey that is a maximum of 11m above ground level), vehicle access for a pump appliance should be provided to whichever is the less onerous of the following: • 15% of the perimeter. • Within 45m of every point of the footprint of the building a. 22. For all other buildings, provide vehicle access in accordance with Table 15.1 of Approved Document. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for firefighting. Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue requires a minimum carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping appliances of 18 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2000 part B5. a. 23. If it is not possible to provide access to the proposed development in accordance with the guidance details within Part B5 of Approved Document B, as compensation, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue may accept the provision, at the developer's expense, of an automatic sprinkler system, designed, fitted and maintained in accordance with the relevant sections of BS5306/BSEN12845:2004. 24. 25. Should this option be considered, our Fire Safety advisers must be provided with detailed plans of the proposed sprinkler installation. Any scheme proposed should not be of a lesser standard than any provision as may be required by the Building Regulations	The Proposed Development layout and design has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. Paragraph 4.4.7 of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** notes that a Risk Management Plan shall be developed with the LFRS post consent at the detailed design stage which, as a minimum, will provide advice in relation to potential emergency response implications including safe access to and within the facility for emergency vehicles and responders, including to key site infrastructure and fire protection systems.
	22	<u>Water Supplies</u> 26. A building requires additional fire hydrants if both of the following apply. a. It has a compartment with an area more than 280m2. b. It is being erected more than 100m from an existing fire hydrant. c. d. If additional hydrants are required, these should be provided in accordance with the following: e. For buildings provided with fire mains – within 90m of dry fire main inlets. f. For buildings not provided with fire mains – hydrants should be both of the following: i. Within 90m of an entrance to the building. ii. A maximum of 90m apart. iii. *All fire hydrants should conform to BS750-2012 Each fire hydrant should be clearly indicated by a plate, fixed nearby in a conspicuous position, in accordance with BS 3251. Guidance on aspects of provision and siting of private fire hydrants is given in BS 9990. Fire hydrant acceptance testing will be carried out by a Hydrant Inspector on completion and a standard hydrant marker "H" plate will be fitted nearby. Following adoption the Fire Service will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance and repairs for the lifetime of the fire hydrant. 27. Where at the time, it is not possible to determine the number of fire hydrants required for firefighting purposes, the requirement should be determined at the water planning stage when site plans have been submitted by the water companies.	<u>Water Supplies</u> The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, which has been updated and is to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, outlines the water supply strategy for firefighting (ref. Section 4.3). The Solar Station Compounds will be designed to integrate pressure fed (pump driven) fire hydrants and/or static water tanks (tanks can be integrated above or below ground) for firefighting, depending on available water supply. Water provision will be designated for the cooling of adjacent BESS or ESS equipment. Water tanks will be located at least 10m from the nearest BESS enclosure. Water access points, whether hydrants or tank connections, would be located in consultation with LFRS to provide redundancy and safe operating distances for firefighters with 30 – 50m, which is considered an optimal safe distance. Tanks and water outlets would be clearly labelled with appropriate signage and marked on site plans. Additionally, to avoid any mechanical damage, outlets and hard suction points would be safeguarded with bollards. The firefighting water requirement will be fully assessed at the detailed design stage based upon BESS fire and explosion test data by an independent Fire Protection Engineer and water storage volumes will be agreed with LFRS during detailed design. Each indicative BESS area design will contain a minimum of two firefighting water storage units of no less than 230,000 litres in capacity, capable of delivering 1,900 litres per minute for 2 hours (in line with NFCC guidance). Water storage will either be in sectional steel panel tanks, or cylindrical steel tanks, above or below ground. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** will form the basis for the preparation of a detailed fire safety management plan at a later stage to ensure the delivery of a robust fire safety strategy in relation to the BESS and will be secured by Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		28. Where no piped water supply is available, or there is insufficient pressure and flow in the water main, or an alternative arrangement is proposed, the alternative source of supply should be provided in accordance with the following recommendations a. a charged static water tank of at least 45,000 litres capacity; or b. a spring, river, canal or pond capable of providing or storing at least 45,000 litres of water at all times of the year, to which access, space and a hard standing are available for a pumping appliance; or c. any other means of providing a water supply for firefighting operations considered appropriate by the fire and rescue authority.	
	23	<u>Environmental</u> 29. Bulk storage of highly flammable/explosive/water reactive/toxic substances and any site whereas large scale recycling activities are proposed will need to be specifically consulted with Fire Authority to ensure that the full operational impact, should a fire occur, is assessed and that an adequate provision is recommended. 30. 31. There are a number of methods available, through which the fire water runoff problem can be addressed, the most obvious being to use a fire suppression system to contain a fire, thus not requiring large volumes of water and containment measures, such as bund walls or drainage systems with lagoons, interceptors, reed beds or treatment plants. It is not for the fire service to stipulate which approach to take, simply to ensure that suitable measures are made a condition of planning approval through a firefighting water run-off strategy. 32.	<u>Environmental</u> The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** requires that a site plan be provided at the detailed design stage to LFRS, and includes (ref. paragraph 4.2.9): • "*any areas where hazardous and flammable materials are stored on site (location of gas cylinders, process areas, chemicals, piles of combustible wastes, oil and fuel tanks);* • *Any areas where hazardous and flammable materials are stored on site (location of gas cylinders, process areas, chemicals, piles of combustible wastes, oil and fuel tanks);* • *All separation distances;* • *Any areas where combustible liquid wastes are being stored* • *Storage areas with pile dimensions and fire walls (where applicable) – this includes wastes stored in a building, bunker, or enclosures – include indicative pile layouts and ensure it is geographically representative*". The detailed design would continue to be developed in close liaison with LFRS, as secured by Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regard to the firefighting water run-off strategy, this is outlined in Section 4.11 of Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS of the ES **[APP-147]** and is assessed in terms of impacts to the water environment in Chapter 9 Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**.
	24	<u>BESS Requirements</u> LFR recognises the use of batteries (including lithium-ion) as Energy Storage Systems (ESS) is a new and emerging practice in the global renewable energy sector. As with all new and emerging practices within UK industry the Service would like to work with the developers to better understand any risks that may be posed and develop strategies and procedures to mitigate these risks. LFR will work and engage with the developer as the project evolves, to ensure it complies with the statutory responsibilities that we enforce. The developer should produce a risk reduction strategy (Regulation 38 of the Building Regulations) as the responsible person for the scheme as stated in the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. We would also expect that safety measures and risk mitigation is developed in collaboration with LFR. The strategy should cover the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the project.	<u>BESS Requirements</u> The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is a key document produced as part of the DCO application that addresses the safety measures proposed for the BESS thereby acting as a risk reduction strategy. It is noted that with Springwell Solar DCO the BSMP constituted the risk reduction strategy. The detailed BSMP will be developed in accordance with Requirement 7 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which requires that the chosen BESS work (i.e. Work No. 2 or Work No. 3) must not commence until a BSMP has been submitted to and approved by LCC, in consultation with LFRS and the Environment Agency. Requirement 7 also provides that the detailed BSMP must be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. It is noted by the Applicant that LFRS will want to review the transport strategy to minimise the impact of increased daily vehicle movements in the local area and prevent an increase in the number of potential road traffic incidents. As set out in paragraph 4.4.7 of the Framework BSMP

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representation
		During the construction phase the number of daily vehicle movements in the local area will significantly increase. The Service will want to view the transport strategy to minimise this impact and prevent an increase in the number of potential road traffic incidents. Any development should not negatively impact on the Service's ability to respond to an incident in the local area. LFR works within the guidance of the National Fire Chief's Council (NFCC) who have been working with several government departments to ensure that fire and rescue services are made aware of any new proposals. NFCC have created a guidance document (link below) that constitutes LFR's requirements for new BESS development proposals. LFR are aware that large scale BESS is a fairly new technology, and as such risks may or may not be captured in current guidance in pursuance of the Building Regulations (as amended) and the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. This will highlight challenges the FRS have when responding to Building Regulations consultations. For this reason, we strongly recommend applying the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems. Failure to comply with the above requirements at planning stage can seriously compromise firefighting operations resulting in unnecessary risk to life, loss of property and unnecessary damage to the environment. Recognising that LFR are statutory consultees as a result of the Planning Act 2008 and applications that involve 'National Significant Infrastructure Projects' (NSIPs), we will work and engage with the developer as the project evolves, to ensure it complies with the statutory responsibilities that we enforce.	**[APP-198]**, a Risk Management Plan shall be developed with LFRS post consent at the detailed design stage which, as a minimum, will provide advice in relation to potential emergency response implications, including the establishment of response times and site arrival protocols. The transport strategy would be reviewed in this respect as part of this Risk Management Plan developed alongside LFRS. The Framework FBSMP **[APP-198]** in Section 5: Pre-construction Requirements outlines the key risk assessment tools to be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling at the detailed design stage. The Applicant can also confirm at the detailed design stage, the selected BESS design will have completed Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) to fully inform inputs to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. The selected BESS, as mandated under NFPA 855 (2026 Revision), will have undertaken LSFT as part of UL 9540A tests and / or 3rd party full scale destruction testing. This testing involves burning the full BESS system to validate safe equipment spacing and performance test active and passive mitigation systems integrated into the BESS design. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** recognises the evolving nature of standards and guidance relating to BESS design (ref. paragraph 1.2.8), and confirms that the BESS will be designed in accordance with the UK and internationally recognised good practice guidance available at the time – this includes any testing in accordance with the relevant guidance at the time of detailed design. Through the described test program and detailed risk assessment tools the Applicant will demonstrate that the selected BESS design will not cause any significant offsite impacts to sensitive receptors if a BESS failure occurs. In its Procedural Decision of 21 November 2025 **[PD-007]** the Examining Authority requested that LCC advise the LFRS of the need for it to submit a SoCG with the Applicant. A SoCG for LCC, which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**, will include matters for LFRS.

4. Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations

4.1 Thurlby Parish Council

Table 4-1: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Thurlby Parish Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Thurlby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Thurlby Parish Council Relevant Representation
RR-283	1	The majority of the Parish are against this project because of loss of agricultural land, noise and light pollution in what is a very rural area. There are warehouses in the area that could accommodate solar panels. It doesn't appear that brownfield sites or other alternative sites have been considered. This is the wrong place for this type of development.	With regards to the loss of agricultural land, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent. Furthermore, it is noted that agricultural land required for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development constitutes 0.09% of the total farmland in the East Midlands. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed (as is currently the case) in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5). With regards to noise, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]** of the ES assesses the potential noise impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning as a result of the Proposed Development; the ES chapter describes the embedded mitigation measures to be implemented and, with the commitments to minimise noise made within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** and Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, does not identify any significant adverse residual noise effects. It should be noted that whilst the potential for significant vibration effects at three receptors (R26, R35 and R50 – see paragraph 11.9.2) during construction is identified in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**, this assessment is based on worst-case parameters and are likely to over-estimate vibration levels. If driven piling is to be undertaken, a commitment is included in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. NV-C1) to undertake a construction vibration risk assessment such that significant effects would be avoided. If it is unavoidable that the relevant levels would be exceeded, the risk assessment would focus on limiting the exposure of nearby receptors to levels of vibration exceeding the relevant thresholds as far as reasonably practicable. Furthermore, the timing of any driven piling within 60m of residential receptors will be delayed until after 10am to avoid

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Thurlby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Thurlby Parish Council Relevant Representation
			more sensitive time periods. Again, these significant effects would only occur for the short-term duration during which the driven piling works (if undertaken) are happening near to these residences. Management and mitigation measures have been included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to minimise these impacts as far as practical. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regards to light pollution, as secured within the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. LV-O3), the proposed lighting has been designed to avoid light pollution and adverse effects. The following mitigation has been embedded: • No areas of the Proposed Development will be continuously lit. • Operational lighting will be triggered by Passive Infra-red Detector (PID) systems, which will be installed around the perimeter of the Proposed Development. • Lighting will be directional with care to minimise potential for light spillage beyond the DCO Site particularly towards neighbouring properties, habitats, highways or waterways. • Lights installed will be of the minimum brightness and/or power rating capable of performing the desired function. • Light fittings will be used to reduce the amount of light emitted above the horizontal (reduce upward lighting). • The lighting of the primary substation will be motion sensor triggered, that would operate from dusk. • Low level lighting on specific operational units will be triggered by motion sensors, from dusk. • The inward facing CCTV cameras will typically use night-vision technology and will not require additional lighting. Production of a detailed OEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regards to exploring the scope to utilise non-agricultural land (such as warehouses and brownfield sites) for development, Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** sets out the methodology adopted for the site selection process and Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. As set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** (ref. paragraph 4.3.5), three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of the sites was large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres). The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Therefore, no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, 2 of the 3 sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site, Hawdin's Wood, included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, however given the site has

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Thurlby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Thurlby Parish Council Relevant Representation
			been developed for a range of uses, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that the use of brownfield land (alongside other locations for solar development), has an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar developments, including solar on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. As demonstrated above, these land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** (ref. Section 4.3).

4.2 Welbourn Parish Council

Table 4-2: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Welbourn Parish Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
RR-288	1	The development covers too large an area. It will have a detrimental visual impact.	As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]** smaller scale solar schemes, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050. The Government recognises in the Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. The Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development in its pursuit of securing good design as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development, as detailed within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, but considers that some impact is inevitable. This is also reflected in the Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 which states that *"virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation."* Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** demonstrates that significant landscape and visual effects would predominantly be in the short to medium term during construction and the early years of operation while planting matures. For example, there are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on residents of local villages as, by year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping would have matured such that views of solar PV infrastructure within the Site would be screened.
	2	There are proposals to develop two other large scale solar farms within a 10-mile radius of Welbourn and Leadenham. Should all the proposals proceed, the accumulative effect of 9100 acres of solar farms on the landscape would be devastating.	Cumulative effects and interactions between the Proposed Development and other solar NSIPs are assessed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. The short list of cumulative developments, inclusive of the relevant solar proposals in the area, has been agreed with NKDC and LCC. The agreed short list of cumulative developments is provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. The cumulative assessment contained in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** is consistent with PINS Guidance on Cumulative Effects and follows a proportionate methodology as outlined in GLVIA3. The assessment primarily focusses on the cumulative schemes within the 2km ZoI, as this was judged to be the geographic area across which landscape and visual effects were most likely to occur, although the nearest NSIP scale solar schemes beyond 2km were also scoped in to the cumulative assessment given their similar scale and typology to the Proposed Development.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
			As summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. paragraph 15.5.24), significant adverse cumulative effects are identified on landscape and visual amenity receptors, however the significance of effect attributed to the Proposed Development alone is not increased when considering these other developments alongside the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The following significant cumulative effects were established during construction, where the magnitude of effect is higher than that of the Proposed Development in isolation. During construction: • Major Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects upon the North Kesteven District landscape sub-area Witham and Brant Vales due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction. Additionally, changes are anticipated to the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way (PRoW Cole/2/1 and BooG/2/2) as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID95 Application Reference: PL/0087/23, North Hykeham Relief Road, resulting in a Major adverse effect which is significant. • Moderate Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects on the North Kesteven landscape sub-area Limestone Heath due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID63 Application Reference: EN010149, Springwell Energy Farm and ID103 Application Reference: EN0110016, Leoda Solar Farm, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect which is significant. During operation (year 15) it is considered there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that, given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. It is therefore the Applicant's view that these Reports further support the conclusion that significant cumulative effects on landscape and visual receptors resulting from the Proposed Development and other schemes beyond the 2km Zone of Influence are unlikely.
	3	The plans involve constructing solar panels very close to existing residential premises. (The World Health Organisation recommends Solar Farms are not built within 2miles/3km of residential properties and areas.)	The Applicant has found no published studies or communications from the World Health Organisation (WHO) that suggest the WHO recommends Solar Farms should be located 2 miles from residential properties. As detailed in Table A-1 Design Commitments of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** a minimum offset of 50m from solar infrastructure will be included around all residential properties to minimise potential impacts.
	3.1	There will be a significant loss in agricultural land for food production.	this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
			and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the only permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse (not significant) effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5). The Applicant recognises that there are concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon food production. However, it is important to place the scale and nature of land use into context. As considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Proposed Development recognises the need to allow current farming practices to continue. The Order Limits include areas of new grassland for bird mitigation and a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. Furthermore, to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on BMV land Chapter 12: Socio-Economic and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** sets out embedded mitigation measures including the use of panels at a height which could support sheep grazing, and capitalising on the opportunity to improve soil structure during the period of suspended agricultural activities throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, the Framework SMP **[APP-192]** a detailed version of which is secured, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework, via Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, contains industry standard good practice mitigation measures to reduce impacts on soil which will ensure

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
			that the ALC grade will be unaltered through operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
	4	The solar panels are not recyclable and are outdated.	As detailed in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** paragraph 2.8.1-4: *"The Principal Contractor will separate the main waste streams on-site, prior to transport to an approved, licensed third party waste management facility for recovery, recycling or disposal. A Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) will be prepared by the Principal Contractor, which will provide a waste estimate and specify key responsibilities, reporting and auditing requirements and waste recovery targets. The SWMP will be finalised with specific measures to be implemented prior to the start of construction. All waste to be removed from the DCO Site will be undertaken by fully licensed waste carriers and taken to licensed waste facilities and managed in line with the requirements of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations (2011) and the Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations (2005). The Proposed Development will apply the waste hierarchy, in priority order; prevention, preparation for reuse, recycled, other recovery and disposal."* The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** is secured by Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. As outlined in Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** Section 14.5 Materials and Waste, paragraph 14.5.88: *"The UK company SolRecycle reports a recovery rate of 95% for solar PV Panels"*. As outlined in paragraph 14.5.91: *"It is assumed that specialist regional or national facilities would be in place at the time of component replacement and decommissioning, and these would be developed in response to demand generated by the UK-wide solar PV panel industry and waste components would be reused, recycled, or recovered and not disposed of to landfill."* At present, solar PV panel waste generation is low, therefore there is a limited demand for facilities that recycle this infrastructure and there is therefore associated limited available capacity. It is a new, emerging market but the Applicant is aware of 5 UK facilities that currently recycle solar panels. These facilities report 95-99% recovery rates following recent investment, which is an improvement on what the market was achieving in the last few years. For example, Solar Recycling Solutions (SRS) states on its website that its London based recycling plant achieves a 99% material recovery rate currently. It is expected that the facilities which reuse, recycle, or recover end of-life solar PV panels will continue to expand (and new companies emerge) as the quantities of this waste stream increase. The landfill tax strongly incentivises reuse, recycling and recovery, but critically the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013 and the Waste Batteries and Accumulators (Amendment) Regulations 2009 place obligations on those who place solar PV panels and batteries on the market to finance the costs of collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal, whilst also requiring a minimum 90% recovery rate. As noted above, it is expected that the current market would expand to improve this.
	5	There is concern that the solar panels are produced by Chinese slave labour.	The specific model of solar PV panels that will be used for the Proposed Development has not yet been chosen. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Applicant receive consent, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right solar PV panels for the Proposed Development. When doing so, the Applicant will treat the need to ensure an ethical supply chain with the utmost importance and is fully committed to the responsible and ethical procurement of all its equipment.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
			The Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and has provided for this to be a legal obligation under the DCO. This will be achieved through the development of a detailed ESSCP, which will be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with the DCO application, as secured under Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Framework ESSCP includes a commitment (ref. paragraph 3.4.8) that any qualifying supplier must participate in a modern slavery supplier due diligence exercise, and the supplier must publish annually a slavery and human trafficking statement that meets the statutory requirements of section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015, whereby the supplier must pay and treat its workers in compliance with applicable employment laws and minimum wage requirements. Further details regarding ethical and environmental responsibilities are provided in the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**.
	6	The battery energy storage systems have been known to catch fire spontaneously and proved difficult to extinguish.	The Proposed Development includes embedded design mitigation and protection measures to reduce fire risk, which are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. These measures include an automatic cooling system which will be integrated into the BESS to stop or reduce battery cell thermal runaway propagation. The BESS is designed so that in the event one cell overheats/catches fire, there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent which it is possible to control this)). This layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. LFRS in foreseeable and credible emergency response scenarios would most likely adopt a defensive firefighting strategy by using water on neighbouring areas such as battery enclosures and structures to cool down and prevent further fire spread. This approach ensures that environmental pollution risks are minimised and is in line with NFCC Guidance which states "*If it can be confirmed that the recommended firefighting tactic for the BESS is to defensively fire fight and boundary cool whilst allowing the BESS to consume itself, this will reduce the water requirements, and thus the drainage/environmental protection requirements significantly.*". The focus of the Framework BSMP **[APP-189]** is to prevent a fire occurring. There have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, as secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the LFRS are a named consultee on this Requirement, and as such the LFRS will have the opportunity to review the detailed BSMP prior to any approval.
	7	The planned proposal will see a solar farm and battery storage area built on the approach path to RAF Waddington. The daily glint of the panels will provide distraction to pilots, especially members of the Red Arrows who perform display routines overhead.	Engagement has been undertaken with key stakeholders including the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) (the operating arm of the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and responsible for managing the defence estate, including all RAF bases). The matters discussed specifically included the Glint and Glare assessment of circuit patterns at RAF Waddington. Section 14.3 of Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** assesses the potential impact of the Proposed Development on glint and glare. RAF Waddington has been assessed in detail with the approach path into the two runways, air traffic control tower (ATCT) and two circuit paths (east and west) being assessed for glare impacts. Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]** concludes that the overall impacts on aviation assets, including RAF Waddington, are acceptable and not significant (ref. paragraph 8.3(e)).

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
	8	Residents will be unable to enjoy a normal countryside walk and will therefore suffer a loss of amenity.	The Applicant recognises the amenity value of the site and its surroundings, in particular the importance of PRoWs to local residents, and has sought to enhance local connectivity through sensitive design. The Applicant has designed the Proposed Development to create links that integrate with existing and proposed routes to support cycling and pedestrian access to benefit local amenity value and will avoid the closure of PRoWs wherever practicably possible. Details are provided in the Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** a detailed version of which will be developed, substantially in accordance with the Framework as secured by Requirement 18, under Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Potential impacts on PRoW are assessed in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraphs 12.7.29 – 12.7.35). There are 36 PRoW and seven permissive paths located within the Principal Site, as well as 26 PRoW which run alongside the boundary or are within close proximity to the Principal Site. Furthermore, there are five PRoW which could be impacted by the Cable Corridor. The Proposed Development would require the permanent diversion of three PRoW, each of which is assessed to result in a negligible effect, which is considered not significant. Some PRoW may need to be temporarily closed to facilitate the safe construction of the Proposed Development. Where a PRoW is proposed for temporary closure, a diversion route has been proposed for the duration of the closure, with the original PRoW to be fully reinstated upon completion of the relevant works. The Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]** show each proposed temporary PRoW closure, as well as the corresponding proposed indicative location of temporary PRoW diversion. The Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** outlines how the Applicant will manage PRoW within the Order Limits to ensure they have been suitably considered and will continue to operate effectively throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** reviews both user safety and accessibility, during the complete life cycle of the Proposed Development, considering the potential interaction and impact on the PRoW associated with the construction works, as well as the day-to-day operation of the Proposed Development. Fencing around the Order Limits will be a 'stock proof fence' (i.e., wooden posts and metal wire mesh) and will be up to 2m in height. Palisade fencing will only be utilised around the perimeter of the BESS compounds (Work No. 2 and 3), and the Onsite Substation (Work No. 4) and will be up to 2.5m in height and painted in a muted colour sympathetic to the surrounding environment. Where development is proposed adjacent to a PRoW, there will be a minimum offset of 10m from the centre line (minimum 20m total). Where development is proposed on both sides of a PRoW, sections of wider offsets reflecting local features, such as hedgerows, will be integrated to vary the extent of views experienced across the Principal Site, where practicable. These buffers are secured by Requirement 6: Detailed design approval as set out in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Additionally, the Applicant has committed to creating approximately 9.5km of new permissive paths to supplement the existing PRoW network, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. The proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, providing more effective linkages across the site.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
			The Proposed Development will create new permissive paths available to the public during the operational lifetime. These permissive paths include: new connections around Cathedral Park; a new connection at Tunman Wood; a new connection at Thurlby; and a new circular route to the west of Bassingham. These permissive paths are secured in Requirement 17: Permissive paths and Requirement 8: Landscape and ecological management plan as set out in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]**.
	9	The area is home to roe and muntjac deer, fox, badgers, multiple birds of prey (buzzard, red kite, owl, hawk), other rare birds such as skylark, all of which will be severely impacted by the proposal.	As described in Section 8.2 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** the assessment of significant biodiversity effects of the Proposed Development has been conducted in line with the relevant ecological legislation, policy, and guidance as detailed within Appendix 8-A: Ecology Legislation, Planning Policy Context and Guidance **[APP-133]**. With the implementation of mitigation secured by the management plans submitted with the DCO Application (e.g. the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**), Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** concludes that there would be no effect upon 'other mammals' (ref. Table 8-15). To ensure impacts on mammals such as roe deer, muntjac deer, fox and badgers are minimised, all security perimeter fencing will include gaps to allow small/medium sized mammals (including deer) to pass underneath at strategic locations to maintain ecological connectivity, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (e.g. ref. ECO-C1). The final locations of these mammal passes will be determined following pre-commencement surveys. Existing hedgerows and wildlife corridors will also be retained outside of the security perimeter, to allow the continued movement of mammals across the landscape. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid badger setts, as set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and will adhere to best practice measures to minimise impacts on badgers. In addition to these best practice measures, pre-commencement checks will be carried out and measures will be implemented to avoid animals being injured or killed within construction areas. In the event that a badger sett is present within the works area and impacts cannot be avoided, the appropriate licensing process will be followed. As detailed in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** and secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** (ref. paragraph 5.3.78) artificial bird boxes and bat boxes will be installed in existing woodland areas, on retained individual trees and existing trees in hedgerows to increase the availability of nesting and roosting features and enhance the value of these habitats for these species' groups. Boxes will be of varying designs to suit different species of birds and bats will be installed in suitable locations to be determined by an ecologist at the time of installation. A minimum of 30 bird and 30 bat boxes are proposed. A minimum of five tree-mounted, or tower-mounted barn owl boxes will be provided in the Order Limits located >1km from the A46, A607 and A15. New habitat created (such as grassland, species rich meadows, new tree planting) as part of the Proposed Development will provide additional foraging resources for these species. The extent and type of mitigation provided by the Proposed Development has been informed by the detailed ornithological surveys undertaken by the Applicant, as detailed in Appendix 8-G: Breeding Birds **[AS-086]** and Appendix 8-H: Non-breeding birds **[AS-087]** of the ES and summarised in Table 8-13 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. The mitigation provision for ground-nesting birds, including Skylark, consists of 64ha (158.1 acres) of permanent grassland and a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable. These areas are indicatively illustrated as Arable fields A to F on Figure 8-5: Bird Mitigation Land Allocation of the ES **[AS-046]** but could be rotated within the areas of the Order Limits where

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
			there is no solar PV infrastructure, providing the principles for field sizes are achieved. The mitigation is secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** and secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Table 8-15: Determination of potential impacts and effects on IEFs – Habitats and Species outlines that there is no potential for an effect to occur on both breeding birds during operation or decommissioning and on non-breeding birds during construction, operation or decommissioning. With the application of mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 8.12.19-26 the Proposed Development will have a minor adverse effect (not significant) on habitat for ground-nesting birds during construction.
	10	There are alternative solutions available to meeting the net zero targets.	The decarbonisation of all sectors is essential in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050, as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Increasing solar generation plays a key part in this – as stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*". NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector*." Paragraph 2.10.10 of NPS EN-3 goes on to confirm that solar has an important role in delivering the government's goals for greater energy independence including those of the British Energy Security Strategy which sets out that the government expects a five-fold increase in combined ground and rooftop solar deployment by 2035 (up to 70GW). The Statement of Need **[APP-184]** concludes that new solar developments such as the Proposed Development are needed to decarbonise the UK's electricity supply, provide additional low-carbon energy generation capacity in line with the expected growth in demand, and reduce national dependency on imported hydrocarbon source fuels. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** also describes the consideration of alternatives and the design evolution of the Proposed Development, including how drawbacks and constraints associated with the Proposed Development (such as adverse effects) have been sought to be reduced or removed via embedded mitigation where possible. Other generation schemes, such as wind power, nuclear, coal, tidal, or gas fired power stations, have not been assessed due to their unsuitability at the Order Limits (in the case of a large-scale wind project and nuclear energy) or their inability to contribute to the UK's need for low-carbon electricity (in the case of coal or gas). With regards to efficacy, solar produces similar amounts of energy per ha per year as onshore wind. Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as being vital for a decarbonised grid and can support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear. Large-scale solar is an essential part of the future electricity system which must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching NPS EN-1. The Proposed Development represents a significant opportunity in this respect and would provide a significant contribution to the delivery of the UK Government's commitment to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended).

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
	11	There are serious concerns that if the development goes ahead, the companies responsible for dismantling the farm would not honour their commitments 40-60 years from now.	Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational period the land would be available for its current use. Any material change of use would require planning permission. The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** submitted with the DCO application sets out the principles and measures to be followed in the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. This Framework DEMP is secured within Schedule 2, Requirement 20 of the draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**, whereby detailed DEMP(s) must be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-016]** – this ensures that the decommissioning works must be undertaken in line with the measures secured within the Framework DEMP **[APP-016]**. It should also be noted that breach of the commitments under the Development Consent Order amounts to a criminal offence and the terms of the Development Consent Order are enforceable by the Local Authority.
	12	There are no discernible benefits to the local community.	The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals. This has been thoroughly considered throughout the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development, with input from the local community shaping the final design of the Proposed Development. For example, the proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** to maximise community benefits, providing more effective linkages across the site. Once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. Furthermore, should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW of export capacity per year. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. One way of doing this is by appointing a community foundation which would independently manage the fund, using their local knowledge to identify funding opportunities and help maximise benefits for local communities. A community benefit fund would only operate if the Proposed Development received development consent. To maximise the economic benefits to the local community a Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to skills, supply chain and employment which the Applicant could take forward post-consent. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** also

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Welbourn Parish Council Relevant Representation
			outlines the Applicant's intentions to engage with local schools, local further education providers, local higher education providers. The Applicant recognises that the Proposed Development can assist academic research by linking with local Universities and provide local schools with learning opportunities. Furthermore, the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** provides a structure for delivering ways under which local community members can put forward their ideas and the project can then maximise local benefits. The development of a detailed ESSCP, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework is secured by Requirement 19 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Other wider benefits are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including energy security, decarbonisation, ecological enhancements, employment generation and economic benefits.

4.3 Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council

Table 4-3: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council Relevant Representation
RR-282	1	On behalf of the residents of Thorpe on the Hill, the Parish Council objects to the proposed solar farm development. This is based on a house to house survey of residents where 76% objected to this proposal.	The Applicant acknowledges the survey of Thorpe on the Hill residents undertaken by Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council. The Consultation Report **[APP-023]** sets out the consultation undertaken by the Applicant throughout the DCO Application process. Changes to the design have been made in the vicinity of Thorpe on the Hill in response to feedback received from Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council and local residents during statutory consultation to reduce the impact of the Proposed Development. This has included the removal of solar PV within the field south-east of Thorpe on the Hill, which is now an area of managed arable fields for bird mitigation purposes (i.e. no solar infrastructure proposed), to increase the distance from the village to the Proposed Development itself, and providing additional vegetation screening along Fosse Lane. As such, the Proposed Development design provides a 300m buffer between the proposed solar infrastructure and residential receptors in Thorpe on the Hill. See Figure 3-2A of the ES **[AS-022]** and the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** for details. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** provides further details of all the design changes made in response to responses made to non-statutory and statutory consultation, the outcomes of environmental assessment and national and local planning policy. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW of export capacity per year. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development, such as Thorpe on the Hill, should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. The Proposed Development also offers further benefits to the local community; once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages – this includes the provision of a new permissive path from Cathedral View Caravan Park to Fosse Lane, providing a circular walk and safer route and access to Thorpe-on-the-Hill for residents. The Proposed Development also includes a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. Other wider benefits to the local community, including Thorpe on the Hill, are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including energy security, decarbonisation, ecological enhancements, employment generation and economic benefits. Furthermore, the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with the DCO application provides a structure for delivering ways under which local community members can put forward their ideas

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council Relevant Representation
			and the project can then maximise local benefits. This is secured by Requirement 19 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

4.4 Coleby Parish Council

Table 4-4: Applicant's Responses to Parish Councils' Relevant Representations: Coleby Parish Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
RR-066	1	Coleby Parish Council comments upon and objects to the proposed plans for a solar and energy storage project by Fosse Green Energy to the southwest of Lincoln. The Parish of Coleby lies to the southeast of the proposed solar and energy storage site, and it is likely to be impacted by the proposed grid connection corridor. The village of Coleby is a conservation village and sits within a rural, agricultural setting in an area designated as a character area in the North Kesteven District Council Landscape Character Assessment (2007). The Parish is situated on the Lincoln Cliff Edge with scenic views over the Brant and Witham Valleys and the site of the proposed solar and energy park which also sits within the Witham Valley Country Park. The proposed project will have significant impact on the views from the Lincoln Cliff Edge, it is this impact on the character of the landscape that creates the most concern for Coleby Parish Council and the residents of the parish. The Parish Council recognises that there is a need for carbon neutral energy production but is concerned about this project and sets out its grounds for Objecting to the development proposed:	The Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development in its pursuit of securing good design as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse effects on the landscape character of the Lincoln Cliff and the visual amenity of people travelling along the Lincoln Cliff Edge, including users of the Viking Way, resulting from the Proposed Development. Table 10-11, 10-12, and 10-13 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** conclude that the Proposed Development will have a minor adverse (not significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to no effect (not significant) by Year 1 of operation (in winter) on the Landscape Character Type (LCT): Lincoln Cliff and Sub-area 6: Lincoln Cliff. The assessment also established that the Proposed Development will have a moderate adverse (significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to minor adverse (not significant) by Year 1 of operation (in winter) and no effect by Year 15 of operation (in winter) on the Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA): Lincoln Cliff. It should be noted that there will be no permanent above ground infrastructure installed as part of the Proposed Development on Lincoln Cliff given the proposed grid connection is to be undergrounded. As set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, the Applicant considers that significant landscape and visual effects would predominantly be short to medium term during construction and the early years of operation. There are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on national, regional or district landscape character areas (including Lincoln Cliff as set out above) as, by Year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping (see the Landscape Mitigation Plan provided in Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) would have matured such that there would be a substantially reduced perception of solar PV infrastructure within the Principal Site. The Applicant considers that some landscape and visual impact is inevitable given the nature of the Proposed Development, as reflected in the Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 which states that *"virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation."*
	2	<u>Industrialisation of the area:</u> An area which is intensively rural would become industrialised by the installation of this solar park and its consequential infrastructure to the detriment of the local area, environment and people. The scale and extent of this proposed solar park and many other solar park applications within Lincolnshire will change the nature of the countryside to the detriment of all. The sensitivity of the Lincoln Cliff/Ridge area means such development could be particularly harmful to the landscape character and integrity. The addition of prominent infrastructure in the Witham Valley and possibly across the Lincoln Cliff is a further pressure that is likely to erode the special character of this sub-area and therefore requires specific and firm policy protection in spatial	<u>Industrialisation of the area:</u> While the Proposed Development comprises infrastructure for solar energy generation and associated development (such as BESS), the land is not permanently changed to industrial use in land use planning terms, and it should be noted that the Proposed Development also includes a significant amount of retained arable land. The design of the Proposed Development has sought to minimise impacts upon agricultural land, as explained in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** which sets out the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution – Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
		plans to ensure insensitive development can be resisted in order to protect landscape quality. The scale and extent of development would also lead to significant adverse effects on views from receptors, changing from views within an agricultural or rural landscape to that of a landscape containing large scale solar development.	agricultural land. This has been achieved through the retention of a significant quantum of arable land within the Order Limits (the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.2 acres) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**). This retained arable land (which comprises a significant proportion, approximately 116 ha, of BMV agricultural land) within the Order Limits disperses the areas of solar PV array and affords ecological and economic benefits associated with nesting birds habitat and retained jobs. It should also be noted that the Proposed Development comprises a temporary installation and once the Proposed Development's operational life ends, the infrastructure will be removed, and the land returned to its previous use in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. With regards to the scale of the Proposed Development, as detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]** smaller scale solar schemes, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets for renewable energy generation and achieving net zero. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that large-scale solar is an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development. The Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development in its pursuit of securing good design as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. It should be noted that there will be no permanent above ground infrastructure installed as part of the Proposed Development on Lincoln Cliff given the proposed grid connection is to be undergrounded. With regards to the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** concludes that the Proposed Development will have a minor adverse (not significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to no effect (not significant) by Year 1 of operation (in winter) on the Landscape Character Type (LCT): Lincoln Cliff and Sub-area 6: Lincoln Cliff. The assessment also established that the Proposed Development will have a moderate adverse (significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to minor adverse (not significant) by Year 1 of operation (in winter) and no effect by Year 15 of operation (in winter) on the Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA): Lincoln Cliff. The landscape and visual cumulative assessment (see Section 10.10 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** considers the potential cumulative impact of ten developments within the 2km Zone of Influence, as well as four solar DCO schemes (Springwell Solar Farm, Great North Road Solar, One Earth Solar Farm, and Leoda Solar Farm) due to their similar scale and typology to the Proposed Development. During operation (Year 15) the cumulative assessment concluded there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development and the assessed cumulative schemes.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
			The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes within Lincolnshire in combination with the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that, given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects.
	3	Installation and Decommissioning: The disruption in the local area during installation and decommissioning may be considerable and with the road infrastructure in the area being poor, this will exacerbate traffic problems. The construction and operation of the completed solar park will result in disruption to local residents and businesses using an already overstretched road network, with resulting damage to roads already in need of major repair work. This gives rise to concerns for the safety of local road users, both vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist. The construction and subsequent decommissioning in what is now a 60-year project will cause damage to the environment and loss of amenity and value to local residents.	Installation and Decommissioning: An assessment of the potential effects relating to additional construction traffic including on severance, driver delay, and accidents and safety is carried out within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legalisation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A **[APP-163]**. This concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. The assessment has used the shortest expected construction programme (24 months), which provides a worst-case scenario in terms of construction vehicle trips as this is based on a rapid, and so shorter, construction period that would generate the highest number of peak hour and daily road trips on the local network. LCC and National Highways in their capacity of being responsible for the local and strategic road networks, respectively, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. Production of a detailed CTMP, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CTMP, is secured under Requirement 14 of Schedule 2 to the Draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**, Section 7.3 commits to undertaking road condition surveys pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/ verges during the construction phase of the Proposed Development for re-instatement. With regards to amenity and value to local residents, the Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, where this has been thoroughly considered throughout the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development, with input from the local community shaping the final design of the Proposed Development. For example, the proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** to maximise community benefits, providing more effective linkages across the site. The Proposed Development provides approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. With regards to the damage on the environment, as summarised in Chapter 16 Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**, significant adverse effects relating to the construction phase relate to landscape and visual and vibration impacts only. However,

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
			significant, landscape and visual impacts will be temporary, due to the transient nature of the construction works. With regards to the potential for significant vibration effects, it should be noted that this assessment is based on worst-case parameters and are likely to over-estimate vibration levels. If driven piling is to be undertaken, a commitment is included in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to undertake a construction vibration risk assessment such that significant effects would be avoided. If it is unavoidable that the relevant levels would be exceeded, the risk assessment would focus on limiting the exposure of nearby receptors to levels of vibration exceeding the relevant thresholds as far as reasonably practicable. Furthermore, the timing of any driven piling within 60m of residential receptors will be delayed until after 10am to avoid more sensitive time periods. Again, these significant effects would only occur for the short-term duration during which the driven piling works (if undertaken) are happening near to these residences. Management and mitigation measures have been included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to minimise these impacts as far as practical. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. During the operational phase of the Proposed Development, there would be some adverse landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development, as detailed within the ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**, however the Applicant considers that some impact in this regard is inevitable. This is also reflected in the Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 which states that *"virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation."* As set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 4.1.4), the overall goal of the landscape strategy is to integrate the Proposed Development into its surrounding landscape and to avoid or minimise adverse landscape and visual effects as much as possible. An example of how this has been achieved is through the targeted planting of hedgerows, as illustrated in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, presented in Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, or the appropriate management of hedgerows to screen views (ref. paragraph 5.3.14). As stated in Chapter 16 Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]** (ref. paragraph 16.2.1), during the decommissioning phase, effects would likely be no greater than those set out for the construction phase. The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** secures mitigation and management measures to be implemented during the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development to minimise disruption, for example (ref. AQ-D1) prior to decommissioning, a dust risk assessment will be prepared and a Dust Management Plan (DMP) would be agreed with the Local Authority prior to any works taking place. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework, is secured via Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It should be noted that the Proposed Development will also result in a number of beneficial effects – as set out in Chapter 16: Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**. During the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, it will have a significant beneficial effect on climate (greenhouse gases) due to its generation of its renewable energy by reducing the need for other forms of conventional energy generation which emit greenhouse gases. The Proposed Development would have a carbon payback period of approximately 12 years for whole life carbon emissions (including replacements), with the payback period for construction emissions being approximately 4 years of operation. There would be 3,302,906 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) avoided by the Proposed Development over the 60 year operational lifetime. Furthermore, the habitat and landscaping proposals will enhance and lead to moderate

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
			beneficial significant effects on five habitats: woodland and trees, standing water, rivers and ditches, grassland, and hedgerows. The Applicant has committed to deliver a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4) for the Proposed Development, as set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**. This commitment is secured in Requirement 8 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	4	Grid Connection Corridor: The grid connection corridor impacts the Parish of Coleby. Fosse Green Energy have stated that this will be laid underground to the substation proposed by National Grid to be sited at Navenby. The installation of the cables will cause inconvenience to local residents and businesses and damage to the environment during installation.	Grid Connection Corridor: An assessment of the potential effects during construction of the installation of the Grid Connection Cable has been provided within the Environmental Statement. Specifically, additional construction traffic related to the installation of the Grid Connection Cable including on severance, driver delay, and accidents and safety is carried out within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legislation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A **[APP-163]**. This concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. As per Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** potential ecological impacts of the proposed Grid Connection Cable will be temporary and the loss of important features (such as hedgerows) will be minimised or avoided. The Cable Corridor is sufficiently wide that the final route for the cable laying can be micro-sited during detailed design to avoid ecological receptors (protected species, trees, hedgerows). With regards to the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-122]** concludes that the Cable Corridor will result in a major adverse (significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to minor adverse (not significant) by Year 1 of operation (in winter) and no effect by Year 15 of operation (in winter).
	5	Loss of agricultural land: The Parish Council objects on the basis of the loss of good agricultural land at a time of heightened food anxiety. The UK needs to be able to feed its population and at a time of geopolitical instability the use of good agricultural land for energy production seems counterproductive. Lincolnshire is one of the main food producing areas of the UK and the land should be maintained as agricultural land for food production.	Loss of agricultural land: As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. Furthermore, it is estimated that the solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire, together with the Proposed Development, account for approximately 1.4% of the BMV land in the County of Lincolnshire. Whilst there is a degree of uncertainty around this proportion (based upon available data and associated limitations of study) it is indicative that the solar NSIPs represent a small proportion of BMV land in the County. All of these developments will be reversible and the land is projected

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
			to be returned to agriculture on decommissioning, except for relatively small areas used for habitat creation, such as woodland planting, which is anticipated to be retained, and no significant effects on agricultural land were identified for any of the solar NSIPs identified in Section 12.10 Cumulative Assessment of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. The Applicant recognises that there are concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon food production. It is important to place the scale and nature of land use into context. As considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation.
	6	Lack of Industrial Strategy: The development is not taking place within a National Strategic Energy Plan which identifies energy consumption requirements, and the energy production mix required to meet these including nuclear, wind and wave, solar, hydrogen and other new technology initiatives etc. The Parish Council believes that the manufacture and construction of alternative sources of energy should form part of a national industrial strategy and be developed and manufactured in the UK by British Companies. Fosse Green Energy Ltd is a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc, Canadian Solar gets its panels almost exclusively from China, where about 60% of the grid is accounted for by coal-powered energy plants.	Lack of Industrial Strategy: Regarding an overarching strategic spatial strategy for renewable energy across the country, the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP) and Centralised Strategic Network Plan are in the early stages of development and are yet to be published. The SSEP is still in development, with the methodology published in May 2025. The final SSEP is not yet available, with the first iteration of the SSEP expected to be published for public consultation in Q2 2026. NPS EN-3 explains how projects such as the Proposed Development and this Application are required to meet the United Kingdom's Net Zero Targets. Solar forms an important part of a diverse portfolio of energy generating facilities that are required in the UK; which is recognised in NPS EN-1. The Statement of Need **[APP-184]** sets out the need case for the Proposed Development. In summary, electricity generation is identified as being a Critical National Priority and storage (such as BESS) is identified as having a key role to play in achieving net zero and therefore urgently needed to help meet the UK Government's energy objectives. If consented, the Proposed Development would contribute to achieving the UK's energy vision, as set out in both national policy and guidance. The status of the Proposed Development as a large-scale solar development with BESS will allow it to contribute to delivering net zero, support security of supply and contribute to affordability. It is not correct that Fosse Green Energy is a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc. The structure of the partnership is set out in the Funding Statement **[AS-014]** where it states that Fosse Green Energy Limited (the Applicant) is a partnership between Recurrent Energy and Windel Energy. The supplier and make of solar PV and BESS that will be used for the Proposed Development has not yet been chosen. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV and battery technologies are constantly evolving, and new efficiencies are developed regularly.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
			Should the Applicant receive consent, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right solar PV and BESS for the Proposed Development. When doing so, the Applicant will treat the need to ensure an ethical supply chain with the utmost importance and is fully committed to the responsible and ethical procurement of all its equipment. Recurrent Energy is a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc. which is listed on NASDAQ in 2006, reports regularly on its commitment to several environmental, social, and governance factors, including its commitment to responsible and ethical business practices. Its most recent report can be found here: https://recurrentenergy.com/canadian-solar-and-recurrent-energy-release-2023-corporate-sustainability-report/ Recurrent Energy is one of the world's largest and most geographically diversified utility-scale solar and energy storage project development, ownership, and operations platforms. With an industry-leading team of in-house energy experts, Recurrent Energy serves as Canadian Solar's global development and power services business. To date, Recurrent Energy has successfully developed, built, and connected 12 GWp of solar projects and more than 5 GWh of energy storage projects across six continents. As of September 30, 2025, its global pipeline includes approximately 23 GWp of solar power and 73 GWh of energy storage capacity. The company also has over 14 GW of solar and energy storage projects under operations and maintenance (O&M) contracts. These figures exclude China. Windel Energy has more than 5 gigawatts of clean, renewable power and battery energy storage in various stages of development. Windel Energy is committed to responsible land use and believes the development and delivery of a large-scale solar energy and storage park can be achieved in harmony with its surroundings.
	7	Efficiency: The Parish Council is concerned that the solar park will not provide the energy suggested in the application purely on the grounds of lack of sunshine and is therefore not a viable means of providing energy. This raises the question as to whether the wholesale industrialisation of the landscape is worth the benefit to be gained from such a development.	Efficiency: The Applicant acknowledges that the energy generated by solar PV panels is intermittent in nature, due to factors associated with the UK climate and seasonal variations. While efficiency varies by technology and conditions, solar panels are designed to maximise energy production even in less-than-ideal conditions, such as local weather conditions. Innovations in panel design and materials continue to enhance efficiency, making solar power a viable and effective renewable energy source. Overplanting for panel degradation leads to more time in the year when the export capacity is achieved during periods of sub-optimal weather. By co-locating battery energy storage systems (BESS) with solar PV, the Applicant is able to maximise the benefits of the renewable energy generated by the Proposed Development. BESS enables time-shifting of solar output, absorbing energy when generation exceeds demand and discharging it during system peaks in demand. This reduces curtailment, increases utilisation of solar capacity, and can provide ancillary services to the power grid. Further information is provided in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. The solar farm is still considered critical national infrastructure irrespective of whether the BESS would be constructed, and able to make a positive contribution to providing renewable energy to the UK grid mix, as outlined in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**.
	8	Economic Impact:	Economic Impact:

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Coleby Parish Council Relevant Representation
		The Parish Council has had comments from residents concerned about the economic impact upon them as householders, recent surveys showing that properties close to solar parks have less desirability and therefore reduced value. These concerns should be addressed. It is understood that there will be Mitigation for local residents via grants probably managed by local authorities however it would appear that any funds provided by the developer will be based on the kWh generated each year and therefore is unlikely to be available to local residents until well after the solar park has been operational so some considerable time in the future. This mitigation does not therefore assist local residents in the development period of the solar park yet they will have all the disruption and loss of property value. The Parish Council accepts that there needs to be alternatives to carbon creating energy supplies and that there is the proposal that communities local to such developments will be compensated, however the Parish Council understands that this will not be until the development is operational, which could be another 10 years or so, and therefore any immediate benefit to those having to live close to such developments is non-existent.	In 2014, the Centre for Economics and Business Research and Renewable UK conducted a study[13] of over one million homes in the UK to analyse the effect of wind farms on house prices. It found that onshore wind farms had no impact on the value of residential properties within a 5km radius. The Applicant notes that this study serves to illustrate the point, given solar panels are visually less obtrusive than wind turbines, as there are no current studies in relation to the solar sector and no conclusive evidence of solar development leading to reduced housing values. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW of export capacity per year. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. Suggestions to date have included funding towards improvements to existing community facilities, such as village halls and sports facilities, provision of electrical vehicle charging points, subsidised solar PV panels for community use and lower cost energy, grants for broadband and wider improvements, educational visits and wider education/apprenticeship opportunities. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. One way of doing this is by appointing a community foundation which would independently manage the fund, using their local knowledge to identify funding opportunities and help maximise benefits for local communities. A community benefit fund would only operate if the Proposed Development received development consent. The Applicant would contribute to a community benefit fund for the operational life of the Proposed Development; whilst the community benefit fund would not be available during construction the Proposed Development has an estimated short 24-month to 30-month construction period. The Applicant would contribute to a community benefit fund for the operational life of the Proposed Development; whilst the community benefit fund would not be available during construction the Proposed Development has a short 24-month to 30-month construction period. To maximise the economic benefits to the local community a Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to skills, supply chain and employment which the Applicant could take forward post-consent. A detailed ESSCP will be developed, substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP, as secured by Requirement 19 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It should also be noted that Section 12.7 of Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, concludes that during construction of the Proposed Development there would be minor beneficial effects on employment and on gross-value added, which taken together can be considered to be a positive economic impact for residents within a 60 minute-drive time of the Proposed Development during this stage.

[13] Centre for Economics and Business Research. (2014). *The effect of wind farms on house prices* (report prepared for RenewableUK). RenewableUK.

4.5 Haddington Parish Council

Table 4-5: Applicant's Responses to Parish Council's Relevant Representations: Haddington Parish Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Haddington Parish Council Relevant Representations	Response to Haddington Parish Council Relevant Representations
RR-032	1	Unacceptable use of best most versatile farm land. Solar should be on roof tops not farm land. This is a speculative application as there is currently no where for the output of this project to go to. It straddles the A46 gateway to Lincoln and will be a total eyesore. There will be no local say on this project as the planning inspectorate will just rubber stamp the application with total disregard to local objections from individuals, District Councils, Lincolnshire County Council, the Mayor of Lincolnshire and local MP's.	With regards to the loss of agricultural land, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As a result, a significant area of arable land within the Order Limits is retained by the design of the Proposed Development; the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.2 acres) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. This retained arable land comprises a significant proportion, approximately 116 ha (286.6 acres), of BMV agricultural land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent - the Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. Regarding the comment that solar should be on rooftops and not farm land, as detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such as decentralised energy generation on roof tops for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar schemes, including solar on rooftops, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets in relation to renewable energy generation and the achievement of net zero. The Government recognises in the Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Haddington Parish Council Relevant Representations	Response to Haddington Parish Council Relevant Representations
			Regarding the output of the project, the Proposed Development will be connected to the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. Whilst this substation will be subject to a planning application to be submitted by NGET under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, there is no indication that this development will not come forward. At the time of writing, the anticipated timeline provided for the Navenby Substation on NGET's website estimates that a planning application under the TCPA 1990 will be submitted to NKDC in early 2026 for permission to construct and operate the Navenby Substation. This anticipated timeline estimates that the application will be determined in Spring 2026 and, subject to approval, NGET indicated that construction is hoped to begin mid/late 2026. This timeline estimates that the completion date will be late 2029. The Applicant wishes to reiterate that this is the anticipated timeline set out by NGET at the time of writing, and the Applicant does not have information beyond that which is available in the public domain. Given the generally supportive national and local policy position, and on the basis that NGET take a responsible approach to siting, design and mitigation, following the Horlock Rules, there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant why consent for the Navenby substation and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would be withheld. NGET has a legal obligation to provide the Proposed Development and other energy generators with a connection to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS). Following grid connection applications by several energy generators, including Springwell Energy Farm Limited and Fosse Green Energy Limited, National Grid concluded that it would not be possible to connect all the proposed developments to existing regional substations and that a network upgrade would be required, in the form of the proposed Navenby Substation. NGET confirmed that the proposed substation is not due to the Proposed Development alone, but the wider demand for connection in the area. Regarding the Proposed Development's proximity to the A46, given the A46 will be used during construction, an assessment of the potential effects relating to additional construction traffic, including on severance, driver delay, and accidents and safety, is undertaken in Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legalisation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A **[APP-163]**. This concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. The assessment has used the shortest expected construction programme (24 months), which provides a worst-case scenario in terms of construction vehicle trips as this is based on a rapid, and so shorter, construction period that would generate the highest number of peak hour and daily road trips on the local network. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. Production of a detailed CTMP is secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It should also be noted that, as set out in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, the potential to provide direct construction access from the A46 was reviewed and discussed with National Highway, where it was decided not to provide direct access from the A46 for a number of reasons including the potential to disrupt traffic flows mid link where traffic speeds are higher and the geometric requirements for providing a new access junction. Furthermore, as discussed in the Glint and Glare Assessment **[AS-092 – AS-096]**, Road Receptors 13 – 16, located along the A46, were found to have a glint and glare impact of 'None' after hedgerow infill/allowing to be grown out (ref. paragraph 7.1 of the Glint and Glare Assessment **[AS-092 – AS-096]**).

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Haddington Parish Council Relevant Representations	Response to Haddington Parish Council Relevant Representations
			Regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development, the Applicant acknowledges in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]** of the ES that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Receptors will be most impacted during the construction phase, and the number of significant effects will drop by half at Year 1 of operation. The significant effects will further reduce as the mitigation planting will be established by Year 15 (a chosen year of assessment to align with industry practices), replacing the vegetation lost at the construction phase, enhancing landscape pattern, and helping integrate the Proposed Development within the surrounding landscape. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** outlines the landscape and ecology impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Proposed Development, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Proposed Development is operational. Regarding the consideration of local viewpoints on the project and decision making, it is for the Secretary of State to make a decision on the Proposed Development as it is defined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) as it consists of the construction of an onshore generating station in England with a capacity exceeding 50 megawatts (MW) in accordance with s14(1)(a), s15(1) and s15(2) of the Planning Act 2008. As set out in the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, S104(2) of the PA 2008 states that the Secretary of State must have regard to the following in deciding an application for development consent: a. Any relevant NPS (s104(2)(a) of the PA 2008); b. The appropriate marine policy documents (if any) (s104(2)(aa) of the PA 2008); c. Any local impact report (s104(2)(b) of the PA 2008); d. Any matters prescribed in relation to development of the description to which the application relates (s(2)(c) of the PA 2008); and e. Any other matters which the Secretary of State thinks are both important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision (s104(2)(d) of the PA 2008). In terms of objections and local viewpoints, as set out in the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice for submitting representations or comments[14], the Examining Authority will read and consider all comments received. NKDC and LCC are the host authorities and have the opportunity to prepare a Local Impact Report (LIR) now that the DCO application has been submitted for Examination. The LIRs will also be considered by the Secretary of State in determining the DCO application in line with s104(2)(c). Furthermore, the Consultation Report **[APP-023]** sets out the timings of the consultation undertaken, including public consultation to gain an understanding of local viewpoints, which in turn has informed the final design of the Proposed Development. The consultation process has followed the relevant/required process and timings, and sets out how the Applicant has complied with the PA 2008, APFP Regulations and EIA Regulations.

[14] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-for-submitting-representations-or-comments

4.6 Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council

Table 4-6: Applicant's Responses to Parish Council's Relevant Representations: Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council Relevant Representation
RR-256	1	Our Parish Council feel that this application along with other applications in the county of Lincolnshire and particularly NKDC are unnecessary and will do significant damage to the county. The cumulative impact will be considerable, with a significant impact on the visual landscape. It will result in a huge amount of agricultural land being permanently removed, there is considerable risk of contamination to the land through leaching and also the necessity to use significant amounts of concreate and also the potential harms caused by any potential BESS fire. The surrounding parishes and local communities overwhelmingly object to this application and we stand with them.	The need for the Proposed Development is set out fully in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. The UK's transition to a low-carbon energy system is necessary to avoid the effects of climate change. Increasing solar generation plays a key part in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050, in line with the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended) – as stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands. Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as being vital for a decarbonised grid and can support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear. Large-scale solar is an essential part of the future electricity system which must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching NPS EN-1. The Proposed Development represents a significant opportunity in this respect and would provide a significant contribution to the delivery of the UK Government's commitment to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. Regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development, the Applicant acknowledges in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]** of the ES that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Receptors will be most impacted during the construction phase, and the number of significant effects will drop by half at Year 1 of operation. The significant effects will further reduce as the mitigation planting will be established by Year 15 (a chosen year of assessment to align with industry practices), replacing the vegetation lost at the construction phase, enhancing landscape pattern, and helping integrate the Proposed Development within the surrounding landscape. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** outlines the landscape and ecology impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Proposed Development, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Proposed Development is operational. When making a decision on the DCO Application, the Secretary of State will need to balance these impacts against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in the energy NPSs. Regarding the cumulative landscape and visual impact, as summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. paragraph 15.5.24), significant adverse cumulative effects are identified on landscape and visual amenity receptors, however the significance of effect attributed to the Proposed Development alone is not increased when considering these other developments alongside the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The following significant cumulative effects were established during construction, where the magnitude of effect is higher than that of the Proposed Development in isolation. During construction: • Major Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects upon the North Kesteven District landscape sub-area Witham and Brant Vales due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction. Additionally, changes are anticipated to the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way (PRoW Cole/2/1 and BooG/2/2) as a result of the Proposed Development

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council Relevant Representation
			together with ID95 Application Reference: PL/0087/23, North Hykeham Relief Road, resulting in a Major adverse effect which is significant. • Moderate Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects on the North Kesteven landscape sub-area Limestone Heath due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID63 Application Reference: EN010149, Springwell Energy Farm and ID103 Application Reference: EN0110016, Leoda Solar Farm, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect which is significant. During operation (year 15) it is considered there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that, given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. Regarding the loss of agricultural land, this has been carefully considered throughout the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV agricultural land and agricultural operations. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As a result, a significant area of arable land within the Order Limits is retained by the design of the Proposed Development; the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. This retained arable land comprises a significant proportion, approximately 116 ha, of BMV agricultural land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent - the Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. Regarding the risk of contamination to the land through leaching, the source of contamination of concern is not noted in the representation. The Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 14-C) **[APP-170]**, states in Chapter 14 Conclusions in paragraph 14.1.1 that *"The potential risks that have been identified from potential contaminated land have been assessed by the PRA as being very low to moderate / low".* It should be noted that the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. measure GC-C1), Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. measure GC-O1), and

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Scopwick & Kirkby Green Parish Council Relevant Representation
			Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. measure GC-D1) all secure appropriate mitigation in the event that contamination is identified. Regarding the use of concrete on-site, the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** includes specific controls to ensure appropriate management of concrete works (for example. ref. measure WAT-C4(m) "*Where practicable, concrete mixing and washing down of mixing plant is to be carried out by the suppliers and away from the DCO Site. Should on-site concrete washout be required, suitable facilities (e.g. geotextile wrapped sealed skip placed within a bunded area or specialist mobile concrete washout facility) will be provided to ensure that the high alkalinity wash water is adequately contained and prevented from entering surface or groundwater. Wash water will be removed from the DCO Site for appropriate disposal at a suitably licenced waste facility. Concrete washout is prohibited within a minimum of 20m of any body of water, including ditches and ponds, or surface water drains, and within 5m of a foul drain. Where practical, this will increase to 50m;*"). Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Regarding potential harm caused by any potential BESS fire, a variety of assessments have been carried out to address potential areas of risk from the BESS as detailed in the ES **[APP-025 - APP-179]**. The Proposed Development includes embedded design mitigation and protection measures to reduce fire/explosion risk, which are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. These measures include an automatic cooling system which will be integrated into the BESS to stop or reduce battery cell thermal runaway propagation. The BESS is designed so that in the event one cell overheats/catches fire, there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent which it is possible to control this)). This layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. The LFRS would be expected to let a BESS fire burn out, but the focus of the Framework BSMP **[APP-189]** is to prevent a fire occurring. There have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, as secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

4.7 Norton Disney Parish Council

Table 4-7: Applicant's Responses to Parish Council's Relevant Representations: Norton Disney Parish Council

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Norton Disney Parish Council Relevant Representation	Response to Norton Disney Parish Council Relevant Representation
RR-211	1	Norton Disney Parish Council supports the objective of producing energy from solar panels but OBJECTS to Fosse Green Energy's proposals for two primary reasons: 1. Prime agricultural land should not be used for such purposes, when solar panels could be sited on the roofs of commercial buildings and houses to generate the same quantity of energy. 2. Its visual impact on the area will be immense and be detrimental to local people's lives. The diversity of the countryside will be largely taken away. This submission is purposely brief. However, a further one could be made during the examination period if required.	Regarding the comment that solar should be on rooftops and not farm land, as detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such decentralised energy generation on roof tops for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar schemes, including solar on rooftops, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's legally binding targets for the generation of renewable energy and the achievement of net zero (as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended)). The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Regarding the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development, the Applicant acknowledges in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]** of the ES that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Receptors will be most impacted during the construction phase, and the number of significant effects will drop by half at Year 1 of operation. The significant effects will further reduce as the mitigation planting will be established by Year 15 (a chosen year of assessment to align with industry practices), replacing the vegetation lost at the construction phase, enhancing landscape pattern, and helping integrate the Proposed Development within the surrounding landscape. The Framework LEMP **[APP-196]** outlines the landscape and ecology impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Proposed Development, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Proposed Development is operational. Appendix A: Figure 7.15-1: Landscape Mitigation Plan of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** illustrates the increased diversity of the countryside with the Proposed Development providing for new hedgerows, trees, species rich grassland, managed arable, and permanent grassland within the Order Limits. When making a decision on the DCO Application, the Secretary of State will need to balance the impacts of the Proposed Development against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in the energy National Policy Statements[15]. In relation to Norton Disney, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** concludes that during construction and operation of the Proposed Development there will be no impact on Local Landscape Character Area 10: Norton Disney Sandlands, and a negligible adverse (not significant) impact on the residents of Norton Disney during both construction and operation. Residents along Butt Lane will have long distance views east of the construction activities, taking place approximately 450m away from the viewing receptor.

[15] Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) (2024) Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1)
DESNZ (2024) National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)
DESNZ (2024) National Policy Statement for electricity networks infrastructure (EN-5)

5. Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations

5.1 Springwell Solar Action

Table 5-1: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Springwell Solar Action

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation	Response to Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation
RR-260	1	Object to BMV agricultural land being sacrificed for a project that isn't green in the slightest and will do very little for UK energy security.	With regards to the loss of agricultural land as a result of the Proposed Development, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and minimising development on BMV land. As a result, a significant area of arable land within the Order Limits is retained by the design of the Proposed Development; the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. This retained arable land comprises a significant proportion, approximately 116 ha, of BMV agricultural land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent - the Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. Regarding the comment that the Proposed Development will do very little for UK energy security, the Statement of Need **[APP-184]** demonstrates the contribution the Proposed Development will make to the three national energy policy aims, including (see Section 6.2) security of supply and the need for a resilient electricity generating system that can meet the needs of current and future electricity consumers. It is further discussed that recent geopolitical events, including the global energy price crisis of 2022–2023, have underscored the need to enhance domestic energy resilience. Solar generation, such as the Proposed Development, strengthens energy security by producing electricity close to demand, using a UK-based, renewable resource that is not subject to global fuel markets. Compared to gas or coal-fired generation, solar is less reliant on continuous fuel supply chains.
	2	The use of Chinese force labour.	The specific model of solar PV panels that will be used for the Proposed Development has not yet been chosen. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Applicant receive consent, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right solar PV panels for the Proposed Development. When doing so, the Applicant will treat the need to

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation	Response to Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation
			ensure an ethical supply chain with the utmost importance and is fully committed to the responsible and ethical procurement of all its equipment. The Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development being undertaken is pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and has made this a legal obligation under the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This will be achieved through the development of a detailed ESSCP, which will be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with the DCO application, as secured under Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** includes a commitment (ref. paragraph 3.4.8) that any qualifying supplier must participate in a modern slavery supplier due diligence exercise, and the supplier must publish annually a slavery and human trafficking statement that meets the statutory requirements of section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015, whereby the supplier must pay and treat its workers in compliance with applicable employment laws and minimum wage requirements. Further details regarding ethical and environmental responsibilities are provided in the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**. It is noted that the Rule 6 letter **[PD-008]**, Appendix F, notes that issues concerning ethical procurement of imported plant and equipment are relevant to the UK's trade policy and international relations, rather than being land use planning considerations under the Planning Act 2008.
	3	There are serious concerns raised about the safety of any associated BESS sites.	The Proposed Development includes safety-related embedded design mitigation and protection measures, which are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. These measures include an automatic cooling system which will be integrated into the BESS to stop or reduce battery cell thermal runaway propagation (the process by which a thermal runaway event in one battery cell spreads to neighbouring cells, causing a chain reaction). The BESS is designed so that in the event one cell overheats or catches fire, there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent to which it is possible to control this)). The BESS layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. It should be noted that a SoCG is currently under preparation with LCC which will include matters for the LFRS, including the BESS, and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. As set out in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (ref. paragraph 4.5.2), in foreseeable and credible emergency response scenarios, the LFRS would most likely adopt a defensive firefighting strategy by using water on neighbouring areas such as battery enclosures and structures to cool these down and prevent further fire spread. The Proposed Development will select a BESS design that has undertaken full scale free burn testing to demonstrate thermal insulation protection capabilities of the BESS enclosure design, validate equipment spacing distances, and demonstrate that deflagrations (a type of rapid combustion) do not occur and/or can be safely constrained. In accordance with NFCC guidance[16], the Order Limits will be maintained to prevent a fire spreading to the BESS or inadvertently fire loading, by providing a 'bridge' or path between BESS enclosures to transmit flaming or radiant heat. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** further sets out how the BESS will be designed in accordance with the UK and internationally recognised good practice guidance available at the time of detailed design (ref. paragraph 1.2.8), and outlines the design measures to be implemented to prevent a fire

[16] National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) Grid-Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS (2023 and draft revision 2024

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation	Response to Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation
			occurring. It should be noted that there have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance (REF), meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, secured under Requirement 7 (Battery safety management) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the LFRS are a named consultee on this Requirement, and as such the LFRS will have the opportunity to review the detailed BSMP prior to any approval.
	4	Impact on the environment will be negative.	As part of the DCO Application the Applicant has provided a comprehensive Environmental Statement (ES) assessing the environmental impact of the Proposed Development. Chapter 16: Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]** reports during construction the potential for significant adverse landscape and visual, and vibration effects, and during operation the potential for significant beneficial ecology and nature conservation effects, and adverse landscape and visual effects. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development during the operational phase, as detailed within the ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**, but considers that some impact is inevitable. This is also reflected in the Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 which states that *"virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation."* As set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 4.1.4), the overall goal of the landscape strategy is to integrate the Proposed Development into its surrounding landscape and to avoid or minimise adverse landscape and visual effects as much as possible. An example of how this has been achieved is through the targeted planting of hedgerows, as illustrated in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, presented in Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, or the appropriate management of hedgerows to screen views (ref. paragraph 5.3.14). It should be noted that the Proposed Development will also result in a number of beneficial effects – as set out in Chapter 16: Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**. During the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, it will have a significant beneficial effect on climate (greenhouse gases) due to its generation of renewable energy by reducing the need for other forms of conventional energy generation which emit greenhouse gases. The Proposed Development would have a carbon payback period of approximately 12 years for whole life carbon emissions (including replacements), with the payback period for construction emissions being approximately 4 years of operation. There would be 3,302,906 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) avoided by the Proposed Development over the 60 year operational lifetime. Furthermore, the habitat and landscaping proposals will enhance and lead to moderate beneficial significant effects on five habitats: woodland and trees, standing water, rivers and ditches, grassland, and hedgerows. The Applicant has committed to deliver a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4) for the Proposed Development, as set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**. This commitment is secured in Requirement 8 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation	Response to Springwell Solar Action Relevant Representation
			The Proposed Development will also provide benefits to the local community –the Proposed Development provides approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, as set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 6.1.4 and 4.2.4). The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. When making a decision on the DCO Application, the Secretary of State will need to balance adverse impacts against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in the energy NPSs.

5.2 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Table 5-2: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust Relevant Representations
RR-159	1	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust wishes to register to take part in the Fosse Green Energy examination stage due to the high potential biodiversity uplift this development can provide. The Trust have had constructive and agreeable correspondences with the Fosse Green Energy team during the pre-examination stages and wish to continue these into the examination stage. Our main concerns regarding the development are the proximity to (and impacts on) Tunman Wood (LWT Reserve and LWS), habitat creation and enhancement, and impacts on ground nesting birds. The Applicant has addressed these points within the submitted ecological documents, however we wish to provide formal responses regarding these issues as part of the project's examination.	The Applicant will continue to consult with Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust throughout the Examination stage of the Proposed Development. Tunman Wood will be protected and buffered by a minimum distance of 15m from the Proposed Development with the buffer zones in accordance with British Standard Recommendations BS 5837:2012. This measure is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, ref. paragraph 4.1.14, a detailed version of which is to be produced, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured via Requirement 8 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. These buffer zones will not only ensure protection but allow regeneration of the woodland edge to provide additional habitat and linkages from the wood. It should be noted that the potential impact upon Tunman Wood has been considered in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. The assessment concludes (ref. page 8-140) that there will be no potential effect upon the LWS during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development will not result in any loss of habitat within the LWS, nor fragmentation of habitats, or of populations of species using habitats within the LWS during the construction phase. Boundary vegetation, such as hedgerows and ditches, potentially linking LWSs to the Order Limits, will be retained as secured in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. Embedded mitigation measures (see Table 8-13 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**), formalised in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, will ensure there are no impact pathways that will affect the integrity or the functioning of the LWS and consequently that there will be no species mortality of any species using the LWS. During operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development, there are no pathways (e.g. habitat loss or disturbance to designated site features (such as through pollution incidences involved with noise, changes in water quality, air quality, adverse lighting or visual impacts)) which could affect the LWS. Therefore, there are no impact pathways, either directly or indirectly, that would impact upon Tunman Wood during operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. Any decommissioning impacts are expected to broadly align with those for construction and would require mitigating fully in line with relevant legislative and policy requirements at the time of decommissioning. Initial measures are included within the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, a detailed version of which is to be produced, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Habitat creation and enhancement proposals are detailed within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. Specific habitat creation and management for ground-nesting, as well as other bird species, is set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** and secured via Requirement 8 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The extent and type of mitigation provided by the Proposed Development has been informed by the detailed ornithological surveys undertaken by the Applicant, as detailed in Appendix 8-G: Breeding Birds **[AS-086]** and Appendix 8-H: Non-breeding birds **[AS-087]** of the ES and summarised in Table 8-13 of Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. The mitigation provision for ground-nesting birds consists of 64ha (158.1 acres) of permanent grassland and a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable. These areas are

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust Relevant Representations
			indicatively illustrated as Arable fields A to F on Figure 8-5: Bird Mitigation Land Allocation of the ES **[AS-046]** but could be rotated within the areas of the Order Limits where there is no solar PV infrastructure, providing the principles for field sizes are achieved. The mitigation is secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. As set out in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** (ref. paragraph 8.12.26), with the application of the mitigation measures secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, the magnitude of habitat loss for ground-nesting birds is assessed as low, resulting in a minor adverse effect which is not significant in EIA terms.

5.3 Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group

Table 5-3: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
RR-158 / RR-064	1	Inappropriate size and scale: Industrialising in total around 40 km² of our countryside with glass, steel and concrete, changing the very nature of our landscape.	As set out in Chapter 1: Introduction of the ES **[APP-026]** (ref. paragraph 1.1.5), the overall area of the Order Limits is 1,368 hectares (the equivalent to 3,380 acres) – i.e. 13.68km^2, not 40km^2. As noted below, this area also includes a significant portion of retained arable land. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to identify a suitable site that is as least environmentally constrained as possible whilst delivering the benefits of large-scale solar with regards to the contribution to the delivery of the UK Government's commitment to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. With regards to the scale of the Proposed Development, as set out in Section 3.4 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** a site of approximately 1,000 hectares (the equivalent to 2,471 acres) was deemed to be required, taking into account the necessary solar infrastructure to support the 240MW grid connection offer, the need for land to provide environmental mitigation and in order to retain flexibility. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]** smaller scale solar, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. It should be noted that the Proposed Development does not only comprise infrastructure – for example, alongside ecological enhancement measures and habitat provision, the Order Limits also include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). The Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development in its pursuit of securing good design as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse landscape and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Development, as detailed within ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**, but considers that some impact is inevitable. This is also reflected in the Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 which states that *"virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation."* The Applicant considers that significant landscape and visual effects would predominantly be in the short to medium term during construction and the early years of operation. For example,

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			there are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on residents of local villages as, by year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping would have matured such that views of solar PV infrastructure within the Site would be screened. As set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 4.1.4), the overall goal of the landscape strategy is to integrate the Proposed Development into its surrounding landscape and to avoid or minimise adverse landscape and visual effects as much as possible. This has been achieved (for example) through the targeted planting of hedgerows, as illustrated in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, presented in Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, or the appropriate management of hedgerows to screen views (ref. paragraph 5.3.14). With regards to the changing nature of the landscape, it is important to note that the Proposed Development would be temporary. The Applicant is seeking consent for a 60-year operational period. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational life, the land will be returned to the landowners and available for its existing use. Although it would be the decision of the landowners whether to return the land to its existing use, any material change of use would require planning permission.
	2	Loss of good farmland, locked up for 40 to 60 years - our lifetimes. Lost opportunity for food, woodland, water or anything else.	With regards to the loss of agricultural land as a result of the Proposed Development, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on best and most versatile (BMV) land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land quality and reducing development on BMV land. As a result, a significant area of arable land within the Order Limits is retained by the design of the Proposed Development; the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.26) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. This retained arable land comprises a significant proportion, approximately 116 ha (286.6), of BMV agricultural land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent - the Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. However, any material change of land use would require planning permission. Furthermore, to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on BMV land Chapter 12: Socio-Economic and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** sets out embedded mitigation measures

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			including the use of panels at a height which could support sheep grazing, and capitalising on the opportunity to improve soil structure during the period of suspended agricultural activities throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, the Framework SMP **[APP-192]** a detailed version of which is secured via Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, contains industry standard good practice mitigation measures to reduce impacts on soil which will ensure that the ALC grade will be unaltered through operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. With regards to the concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon food production, it is important to place the scale and nature of land use into context. As considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. With regards to the comment regarding the lost opportunity for "woodland, water or anything else", given these are not existing or proposed future uses of the Site, consideration of their potential implementation as an alternative to the Proposed Development is not considered relevant.
	3	Damage to our economy: This locks us all into expensive, long-term contracts on fast-outdated technology, bleeding funds out of the UK, while UK electricity prices are kept high, among the highest in the world to pay for it.	In the Government's Clean Power 2030 strategy, Solar PV is identified as a key generation type in the UK's future energy mix, outlining the need for 35GW of solar to be installed by 2035 and a further 35GW installed between 2035 and 2050 bringing the total up to 70GW target by 2050. Solar PV was the world's leading technology for new power generation in 2024 with over 450GW installed across the globe as published by the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA). Given the prevalence, low cost, scalability and potential speed of deployment, as detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant believes that solar will continue to be a key component of the UK's energy mix for the duration of the consent they are applying for. With regards to the technology of the specific components of the Proposed Development, these have not yet been chosen. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. As such, the Applicant is satisfied that at the detailed design phase modern technology will be procured which has a guaranteed minimum return through a manufacturer warranty. It is noted that the Proposed Development itself will not directly lower local electricity prices as the energy generated by the Proposed Development will be distributed across the National Grid network where required – the Applicant does not have the power to dictate where National Grid distributes the electricity that will be generated and therefore cannot control whether it is used locally. From a network management point of view, where feasible, National Grid always aim to use electricity close to the source of generation to minimise system losses, but it may be

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			distributed to other regions if there is a surplus of supply. However, it should be noted that the Applicant is committed to ensuring that the Proposed Development provides benefits beyond those of supporting the UK government's Net Zero ambitions, in order to deliver a positive impact for the local community. Employment opportunities and local spending are considered within Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** and the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with the DCO Application. Section 12.7 of ES Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, concludes that during the construction phase of the Proposed Development there would be minor beneficial effects on employment and on gross-value added, which taken together can be considered to be a positive economic impact for residents within a 60 minute-drive time of the Proposed Development. The Applicant will investigate measures to promote the take up of jobs generated by the Proposed Development by local people. The Applicant is also proposing a community benefit fund, with the intention that this will be delivered in cooperation with local community foundations and NKDC to benefit causes chosen by the local community. The community benefit fund delivered alongside the Proposed Development will provide a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity The Applicant is exploring how this could best be managed. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development are best placed to determine what a community benefit would be, and should be able to benefit from funding towards improvements to existing community facilities, such as village halls and sports facilities, provision of electrical vehicle charging points, subsidised solar PV panels for community use and lower cost energy, grants for broadband and wider improvements, educational visits and wider education/apprenticeship opportunities.
	4	Poor choice of sites, expensively far from where the electricity is needed, no alternatives considered such as on industrial or brownfield sites, no strategic plan.	Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to identify a suitable site. Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** sets out the methodology adopted for the site selection process. Following a formal application to National Grid for a connection into the 400kV Overhead Line at Whisby, the Applicant was informed that this point of connection was not available and instead was offered and subsequently secured a point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby – the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby will be subject to an application under the TCPA 1990 to be submitted to NKDC. Having secured land with willing landowners, and in recognition of the need to consider reasonable alternatives, the Applicant sought to assess the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints. With regards to the Proposed Development being 'far from where the electricity is needed', the energy generated by the Proposed Development will be distributed across the National Grid network to where it is required. The Applicant does not have the power to dictate where National Grid distributes the electricity that will be generated by the Proposed Development and therefore cannot control where it is used. From a network management point of view, where feasible, National Grid always aim to use electricity close to the source of generation to minimise system losses, but it may be distributed to other regions if there is a surplus of supply. With regards to exploring the scope to utilise non-agricultural land, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. Three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of the sites was large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres). The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Therefore, no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, two of the three sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site Hawdin's Wood included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, however given the site has been developed for a range of uses, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, as detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that the use of brownfield land (alongside other locations for solar development), has an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar schemes, including solar on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brown field and non-agricultural land. As demonstrated above, these land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. Regarding the comment that there is no strategic plan, it should be noted that the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP) and Centralised Strategic Network Plan are in the early stages of development and are yet to be published. The SSEP is still in development, with the methodology having been published in May 2025. The first iteration of the SSEP expected to be published for public consultation in Q2 2026.
	5	Years of disruption during construction, replacement, repairs and at end of life.	The Proposed Development construction period is anticipated to take 24-30 months - subject to being granted development consent, construction is anticipated to start in 2031 to enable completion for the agreed connection date of 2033. It should be noted that the construction works will not affect the entirety of the Order Limits throughout this entire construction period, whereby construction-related impacts are likely to be localised and transient given the nature of the works – for example, as noted in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development **[APP-028]** (ref. paragraph 3.4.6) the construction of the Cable Corridor will be undertaken in four concurrent phases over the assumed 24-month programme.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			The potential for disruption during construction works, for example relating to construction traffic and noise and vibration, is noted and assessed as required within the Environmental Statement. The assessments undertaken informed the requirements for mitigation to be secured by the various management plans submitted with the DCO Application – for example, the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. As summarised in Chapter 16 Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**, significant adverse effects relating to the construction phase relate to landscape and visual and vibration impacts only. However, significant landscape and visual impacts during construction will be temporary, due to the transient nature of the construction works. With regards to the potential for significant vibration effects, it should be noted that this assessment is based on worst-case parameters and are likely to over-estimate vibration levels. If driven piling is to be undertaken, a commitment is included in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to undertake a construction vibration risk assessment such that significant effects would be avoided. If it is unavoidable that the relevant levels would be exceeded, the risk assessment would focus on limiting the exposure of nearby receptors to levels of vibration exceeding the relevant thresholds as far as reasonably practicable. Furthermore, the timing of any driven piling within 60m of residential receptors will be delayed until after 10am to avoid more sensitive time periods. Again, these significant effects would only occur for the short-term duration during which the driven piling works (if undertaken) are happening near to these residences. Management and mitigation measures have been included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to minimise these impacts as far as practical. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Furthermore, a Community Liaison Group is secured through Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which requires the establishment of a community liaison group prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development. Such a group has already been established by the Applicant and will continue during construction and operation. This group provides an opportunity for the local community to engage with the Applicant, learn about the detailed design post consent, express concerns, and be kept up to date. There are 36 PRoW and seven permissive paths located within the Principal Site, as well as 26 PRoW which run alongside the boundary or are within close proximity to the Principal Site. Furthermore, there are five PRoW which could be impacted by the Cable Corridor. The Proposed Development would require the permanent diversion of three PRoW, each of which is assessed to result in a negligible effect (see Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, ref. paragraphs 12.7.29 – 12.7.35), which is considered not significant. Some PRoW may need to be temporarily closed to facilitate the safe construction of the Proposed Development. Where a PRoW is proposed for temporary closure, a diversion route has been proposed for the duration of the closure, with the original PRoW to be fully reinstated upon completion of the relevant works. The Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]** show each proposed temporary PRoW closure, as well as the corresponding proposed indicative location of temporary PRoW diversion. The Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** outlines how the Applicant will manage PRoW within the Order Limits to ensure they have been suitably considered and will continue to operate effectively throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** reviews both user safety and accessibility, during the complete life cycle of the Proposed Development, considering the potential interaction and impact on the PRoW associated with the construction works, as well as the day-to-day operation of the Proposed Development.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			During the operational phase of the Proposed Development, any disruption resulting from replacement or repairs would be minimal – as stated in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** (ref. Section 3.5), activity on the Principal Site will be limited and would be restricted principally to vegetation management, equipment maintenance and servicing, periodic replacement of components, periodic fence inspection, and monitoring to ensure the continued effective operation of the Proposed Development. It is anticipated that maintenance and servicing would include the inspection and, if required, renewal and removal, reconstruction, refurbishment or replacement of faulty or broken equipment, but not the removal, reconstruction or replacement of the whole of Work No. 1 (as defined in Schedule 1 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**) at the same time. Maintenance activity would be phased and would therefore be considerably less intensive than during construction. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** secures mitigation and management measures to be implemented during the operational phase of the Proposed Development to minimise disruption, for example (ref. NV-O1) modelling will be undertaken at the detailed design phase to confirm the noise levels at sensitive receptors will be no higher than the levels presented within the table at NV-O1. The provision of a detailed OEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. As stated in Chapter 16 Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]** (ref. paragraph 16.2.1), during the decommissioning phase, effects would likely be no greater than those set out for the construction phase. The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** secures mitigation and management measures to be implemented during the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development to minimise disruption, for example (ref. AQ-D1) prior to decommissioning, a dust risk assessment will be prepared and a Dust Management Plan (DMP) would be agreed with the Local Authority prior to any works taking place. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	6	Cost to the Environment: Panels imported and built using coal-fired power, adding to our emissions by 2030 and raising concerns about slave labour. Batteries using vast amounts of mined Lithium. No recycling is yet possible, so increasing waste as they become outdated or damaged on a big scale.	The infrastructure components, including solar PV panels and batteries, that will be used for the Proposed Development have not yet been chosen. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Applicant receive consent, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right infrastructure components for the Proposed Development. When doing so, the Applicant will treat the need to ensure an ethical supply chain with the utmost importance and is fully committed to the responsible and ethical procurement of all its equipment. The Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and has provided for this to be a legal obligation under the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This will be achieved through the development of a detailed ESSCP, which will be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with the DCO application, as secured under Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]**. The Framework ESSCP includes a commitment that any qualifying supplier must participate in a modern slavery supplier due diligence exercise, and the supplier must publish an annual slavery and human trafficking statement that meets the statutory requirements of Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015, whereby the supplier must pay and treat its workers in compliance with applicable employment laws and minimum wage requirements. Further details regarding ethical and environmental responsibilities are provided in the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			It is noted that the Rule 6 letter **[PD-008]**, Appendix F, notes that issues concerning ethical procurement of imported plant and equipment are relevant to the UK's trade policy and international relations, rather than being land use planning considerations under the Planning Act 2008. As outlined in Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** Section 14.5 Materials and Waste, paragraph 14.5.88 *"The UK company SolRecycle reports a recovery rate of 95% for solar PV Panels"*. As outlined in paragraph 14.5.91 *"It is assumed that specialist regional or national facilities would be in place at the time of component replacement and decommissioning, and these would be developed in response to demand generated by the UK-wide solar PV panel industry and waste components would be reused, recycled, or recovered and not disposed of to landfill."* At present, solar PV panel waste generation is low, therefore there is a limited demand for facilities that recycle this infrastructure and there is therefore associated limited available capacity. It is a new, emerging market but the Applicant is aware of 5 UK facilities that currently recycle solar panels. These facilities report 95-99% recovery rates following recent investment, which is an improvement on what the market was achieving in the last few years. For example, Solar Recycling Solutions (SRS) states on its website that its London based recycling plant achieves a 99% material recovery rate currently. It is expected that the facilities which reuse, recycle, or recover end of-life solar PV panels will continue to expand (and new companies emerge) as the quantities of this waste stream increase. The landfill tax strongly incentivises reuse, recycling and recovery, but critically the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013 and the Waste Batteries and Accumulators (Amendment) Regulations 2009 place obligations on those who place solar PV panels and batteries on the market to finance the costs of collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal, whilst also requiring a minimum 90% recovery rate. As noted above, it is expected that the current market would expand to improve this.
	7	Economy: Long term depression of house prices, tourism, amenity, local agriculture and economy with little or no local benefit.	In 2014, the Centre for Economics and Business Research and Renewable UK conducted a study[17] of over one million homes in the UK to analyse the effect of wind farms on house prices. It found that onshore wind farms had no impact on the value of residential properties within a 5km radius. The Applicant notes that this study serves to illustrate the point, given solar panels are visually less obtrusive than wind turbines, as there are no current studies in relation to the solar sector and no conclusive evidence of solar development leading to reduced housing values. Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land use of the ES **[AS-016]** includes an assessment of potential effects on tourism/recreational amenity and residential amenity arising from the Proposed Development. Section 12.5 identifies the size of the visitor economy and recognises that the villages of Coleby, Bassingham, Navenby and Aubourn contain visitor and recreational attractions, and that there is also a network of PRoWs in the surrounding area which may be used by visitors. With due consideration given to other assessment findings set out in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**, ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]**, ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]** and ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental

[17] Centre for Economics and Business Research. (2014). *The effect of wind farms on house prices* (report prepared for RenewableUK). RenewableUK.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			Topics (Section 14.2: Air Quality) **[APP-039]** as appropriate, the assessment in Section 12.7 of Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land use of the ES **[AS-016]** concludes that overall the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism/recreation receptors and residential receptors is not significant during the construction/ decommissioning and operational phases. Regarding the long term use of agricultural land, it should be noted that a significant area of arable land within the Order Limits is retained by the design of the Proposed Development; the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.2 acres) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. This retained arable land comprises a significant proportion, approximately 116 ha (286.6 acres), of best and most versatile agricultural land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse (not significant) effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent - the Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. With regards to the impact to the local economy, Section 12.7 of Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land use of the ES **[AS-016]** also concludes that during construction there would be minor beneficial effects on employment and on gross-value added. Taken together these can be considered to be a positive impact on the economy for residents within a 60 minute-drive time of the Proposed Development during this stage. To maximise the economic benefits to the local community a Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to skills, supply chain and employment which the Applicant could take forward post-consent. A detailed ESSCP will be developed, substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP, as secured by Requirement 19 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regards to local benefit, the Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, where this has been thoroughly considered throughout the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development, with input from the local community shaping the final design of the Proposed Development. For example, the proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, to maximise community benefits and provide more effective linkages across the site. The Proposed Development provides approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			Furthermore, should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO Application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. Suggestions to date have included funding towards improvements to existing community facilities, such as village halls and sports facilities, provision of electrical vehicle charging points, subsidised solar PV panels for community use and lower cost energy, grants for broadband and wider improvements, educational visits and wider education/apprenticeship opportunities.
	8	Risk of fire and toxic fumes from huge battery developments on health and water.	The Proposed Development includes embedded design mitigation and protection measures to reduce fire risk to human health and the environment (such as water receptors), which are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. These measures include an automatic cooling system which will be integrated into the BESS to stop or reduce battery cell thermal runaway propagation (the process by which a thermal runaway event in one battery cell spreads to neighbouring cells, causing a chain reaction). The BESS layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. It should be noted that a SoCG is currently under preparation with LCC which will include matters for the LFRS, including the BESS, and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. As set out in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (ref. paragraph 4.5.2), foreseeable and credible emergency response scenarios, the LFRS would most likely adopt a defensive firefighting strategy by using water on neighbouring areas such as battery enclosures and structures to cool down and prevent further fire spread. In accordance with NFCC guidance[18], the Order Limits will be maintained to prevent a fire spreading to the BESS or inadvertently fire loading (i.e. the risk in relation to the amount of combustible material available to feed a fire, such as allowing dry grass or other flammable materials to accumulate near the BESS), by providing a 'bridge' or path between BESS enclosures to transmit flaming or radiant heat. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** further sets out how the BESS will be designed in accordance with the UK and internationally recognised good practice guidance available at the time of detailed design (ref. paragraph 1.2.8), and outlines the design measures to be implemented to prevent a fire occurring. It should be noted that there have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, as secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the LFRS are a named consultee on this Requirement, and as such the LFRS will have the opportunity to review the detailed BSMP prior to any approval.

[18] National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) Grid-Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS (2023 and draft revision 2024).

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			An unplanned emissions assessment has been undertaken and is reported in Appendix 14-G Unplanned Emissions Assessment of the ES **[APP-176]**. The assessment assesses the impact of airborne chemicals and gases which would be produced in the event of a BESS fire and shows that the dilution of gases and the distance from the BESS is sufficient to avoid any exceedances of airborne gas safety levels. Even under a worst-case scenario, predicted hydrogen fluoride (HF) concentrations at the nearest receptors would remain below levels identified by the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) as causing notable discomfort. At detailed design stage, assumptions will be verified, and a consequence-based plume assessment will be undertaken and approved by the fire authority. This will inform emergency services planning and is secured through the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, a detailed version of which will be prepared, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, With regards to potential impacts upon the water environment, this is considered in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** – for example, paragraph 9.4.63 of Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** states "*Provision of fire water containment (impermeable water capture to prevent used firewater reaching ground/the surrounding environment) is required. It is currently proposed to contain the external fire water runoff within lined swales surrounding the BESS areas, where it can be held and tested before either being released into the surrounding watercourses or to ground (if found to have no contaminants present, or contaminants that are within acceptable legal limits) or taken off site by a tanker for treatment elsewhere. The swale will then be cleaned of all contaminants. This is secured through the Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy (Appendix 9-D **[EN010154/APP/6.3]**)*". Wording to the same affect is also provided in paragraph 4.11.3 of the Framework SWDS **[APP-147]**. It should be noted that no significant adverse effects to the water environment as a result of the Proposed Development are established within Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]**.
	9	Solar on farmland is oversupplied and outclassed by better options.	The Government has committed to achieving Net Zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 under the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended), whereby the Proposed Development represents a significant opportunity in this respect. Solar generation plays a vital role in this transition. According to the Seventh Carbon Budget[19], over 60% of emissions reductions required between now and 2050 must come from electrification and low-carbon electricity production, enabling a rapid shift toward clean electricity and the electrification of other sectors such as transport and heating. Large-scale solar is an essential part of this shift. It is a proven, scalable technology capable of rapid deployment with minimal environmental impact and low operational emissions. As the UK decarbonises its economy, demand for electricity is projected to double by 2040. With the Clean Power Target of 45- 47 GW of solar generation capacity by 2030, and 45-69 GW by 2035, large-scale projects such as the Proposed Development will be crucial to meeting this benchmark. NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector.*" Paragraph 2.10.10 of NPS EN-3 goes on to confirm that solar has an important role in delivering the government's goals for greater energy independence including those of the British Energy Security Strategy

[19] **Climate Change Committee. (2023).** ***The Seventh Carbon Budget: Climate Change Committee Advice***

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations	Response to Lincolnshire Independents and Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representations
			which sets out that the government expects a five-fold increase in combined ground and rooftop solar deployment by 2035 (up to 70GW). As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that the use of non-agricultural land has an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, the Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes is an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development. As stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands. Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as being vital for a decarbonised grid and can support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to identify a suitable site, where Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** sets out the methodology adopted for the site selection process. The Statement of Need **[APP-184]** sets out the need for the Proposed Development, concluding that there were no alternative technologies or sites studied by the Applicant that could deliver the Design Vision. Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** also describes the consideration of alternatives and the design evolution of the Proposed Development, including how effects and constraints associated with the Proposed Development have been sought to be reduced or removed via design and mitigation secured via the management plans (such as the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**) submitted with the DCO Application, where possible. Other generation schemes, such as wind power, nuclear, coal, tidal, or gas fired power stations, have not been assessed due to their unsuitability at the Order Limits (in the case of a large-scale wind project and nuclear energy) or their inability to contribute to the UK's need for low-carbon electricity (in the case of coal or gas). With regards to efficacy, solar produces similar amounts of energy per ha per year as onshore wind.

5.4 British Pipeline Agency Ltd (Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd)

Table 5-4: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: British Pipeline Agency Ltd (Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd)

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Ltd (Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd) Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Ltd (Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd) Relevant Representation
RR-039	1	1.1 Fieldfisher LLP ("FF") represent the British Pipeline Agency Limited ("BPA") as agents for Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited (in liquidation) ("PRAX") and henceforth wherever the term 'BPA' is used that shall refer to BPA in their capacity as agents for Prax. 1.2 We are instructed by BPA as agents for Prax to advise them in relation to the proposed application by Fosse Green Energy (the "Applicant") for an order granting Development Consent for the Fosse Green Energy Project (the "Application"). 1.3 Prax is in liquidation at the moment and as such it will need time to assess the relevance of the Project to its infrastructure.	The Applicant notes the information provided by Fieldfisher LLP on behalf of the British Pipeline Agency Limited as agents for Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited.
	2	1.4 While BPA do not object in principle to the Application, this is on the basis that acceptable protective provisions can be agreed so as to safeguard Prax's continued ability to operate, access, repair and maintain its pipeline infrastructure and the Order can guarantee that any mitigation measures necessary to keep the pipeline infrastructure safe can be delivered.	The Applicant has engaged with BPA with the intention of agreeing protective provisions to safeguard BPA/Prax's ability to maintain and operate its pipeline infrastructure, as well as ensuring compliance with health and safety requirements. In discussions, BPA has raised concerns about agreeing any protective provisions before further modelling is carried out by the Applicant in relation to risk of AC interference caused by the Proposed Development. The Applicant intends to continue engaging with BPA to attempt to address this concern, and is currently undertaking an AC interference study following discussions with BPA, which will be shared and further discussed with BPA once the Applicant is in receipt of and has considered the results. The Applicant is aware of the importance of ensuring BPA is able to operate, access, repair and maintain its pipeline infrastructure and is intending to negotiate protective provisions that will provide for this, while allowing the Applicant to proceed with the Proposed Development in a way that is safe, well-designed and doesn't risk unnecessary delays to the Proposed Development or risks to existing infrastructure. The Applicant has offered to initiate negotiations on the form of protective provisions whilst the AC interference study is ongoing. The Applicant intends to continue to regularly engage on this subject, with the aim of including bespoke protective provisions with BPA in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** at or before the midpoint of the examination. The outcomes of these negotiations are summarised within the SoCG between the Applicant and BPA/PRAX, which include the points raised by BPA/PRAX that relate to protective provisions. The SoCG is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
	3	1.5 BPA object to the proposed acquisition of land and rights in their current form and will be submitting further representations once it has carried out further investigations.	The Applicant acknowledges that Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd has various interests in respect of rights and apparatus within the proposed Order Limits. Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited was not included in the Book of Reference submitted with the DCO Application as it was not a registered proprietor on the titles within the Order Limits. Furthermore, the Applicant did not receive a completed Land Interest Questionnaire (LIQ) from Prax Downstream UK Limited (PDUK) where such information could have been disclosed. The Applicant will include Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited in the next revision of the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and the Schedule of Negotiations and Powers Sought to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, and will continue to engage with the relevant estates team to ensure the relevant documents are accurate and up to date.

5.5 British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities

Table 5-5: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation
RR-038	1	This Relevant Representation is to be read as supplemental to and in conjunction with FE20B848E Fieldfisher LLP ("Fieldfisher") act for The British Pipeline Agency Limited ("BPA") as agents for Prax Downstream UK Limited ("PDUK") and Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited (in liquidation) ("PLOR") (PDUK and PLOR together being herein referred to as "Prax"). PLOR is the owner of the Pipeline (as defined below) and PDUK is the beneficiary of the land rights relating to the Pipeline and BPA is employed as agent by Prax to operate and maintain the Pipeline and to act on its behalf in respect of this DCO process. Henceforth whenever the term 'BPA' is used, that shall refer to BPA in their capacity as agents for Prax. We are instructed by BPA as agents for Prax to advise them in relation to the proposed application by Fosse Green Energy ("the Applicant") for an order granting Development Consent for the Fosse Green Energy Project ("the draft Order") **[Application Reference: EN010154]** ("the Application")	The Applicant notes the information provided by Fieldfisher LLP on behalf of the British Pipeline Agency Limited as agents for Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited and Prax Downstream UK Limited.
	2	The Application affects Prax as a Category 1 landowner (as lessee/tenant of a number of affected plots of land) and as a Category 2 landowner (as grantee pursuant to a number of deeds of grant of easement) in respect of land containing the high-pressure Lindsey Oil Refinery to Buncefield fuel line together with all apparatus and equipment ancillary thereto ("the Pipeline") being part of the Nationally critical fuel infrastructure network supplying the London airports.	The Applicant acknowledges that Prax Downstream UK (PDUK) Limited has various interests in respect of rights and apparatus within the proposed Order Limits. Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited was not included in the Book of Reference submitted with the DCO Application as it was not a registered proprietor on the titles within the Order Limits. Furthermore, the Applicant did not receive a completed LIQ from PDUK where such information could have been disclosed. The Applicant will include Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited in the next versions of the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and the Schedule of Negotiations and Powers Sought to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, and will continue to engage with the relevant estates team to ensure the relevant documents are accurate and up to date.
	3	Fieldfisher previously submitted a relevant representation to the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of BPA and received the following Registration Identification number: FE20B848E ("The First Relevant Representation"). This representation should be conjoined and read with the First Relevant Representation. As mentioned in the First Relevant Representation, PLOR is in liquidation, and Prax has therefore only recently been in a position to instruct Fieldfisher and to engage with this DCO. The First Relevant Representation explained that while BPA does not object to the Application in principle, it does object to the proposed acquisition of land and rights in their current form, and necessarily reserves its position in terms of making further representations once further investigations have been carried out in order to: 4(a) assess the potential risks posed to the Pipeline and Prax's continued ability to operate access, repair, maintain and replace it; and (b) guarantee that all necessary mitigation measures and land rights necessary to protect the Pipeline (and by extension the Environment) from risk of harm over the short and long term, can be delivered by the Order. Since submitting the First Relevant Representation, BPA has received limited further information from the Applicant in respect of the works to be carried out pursuant to the draft Order ("the Project Works"). Prax would also like to clarify the split of its ownership as between ownership of land and contractual rights as regards the Pipeline. These reasons have prompted the	The Applicant notes this further information; responses to RR-039 (FE20B848E) can be found in Table 5-4.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation
		submission of this further relevant representation. These relevant representations are therefore to be read in conjunction to those submitted under reference FE20B848E. BPA has now been told that the Project Works will involve the crossing of the Pipeline with a high voltage electricity cable ("the Cable"). The Project Works will take place underground, in close proximity to the Pipeline.	
	4	However, to date BPA has only received information in respect of generic pipeline crossings and no information or data to show: (a) full details what works and working methods are proposed within 20 meters of the Pipeline; and (b) how close the Project Works will be to the Pipeline and modelling data to show the predicted levels of AC (Alternate Current) interference ("AC interference") likely to be caused thereby and whether these are within British Standard safety limits; and (c) whether a final decision has been made as to the crossing angle currently proposed in respect of the Pipeline (as this will have a direct impact on AC interference). Initial discussions have indicated that the Applicant wishes to cross the Pipeline at a 60 degree crossing angle. An angle less than 90 degrees of crossing will make the need for mitigation more likely; and (d) what mitigation works (if any) are envisaged to: (i) safeguard the Pipeline from physical harm during the works, and (ii) to protect the Pipeline in the future (once the Cable is energized) from potential damage from AC interference, as this could seriously damage the measures currently in place to protect the Pipeline from corrosion; and (e) to the extent that mitigation measures are necessary (due to operational or safety concerns) that the draft Order has included the necessary land and rights within the draft Order limits. Typically mitigation works might require: (i) the installation of multiple subsurface 'sacrificial' zinc strips either side of and parallel to the Pipeline together with surface mounted monitoring equipment and surface to subsurface cabling); and/or (ii) the installation of a concrete or other barrier above or below the Pipeline; and/or (iii) a concrete 'raft' above the Pipeline to protect against vehicles / other loads). Summary of BPA's principal objections to the proposed acquisition of land and rights in their current form pursuant to the draft Order:	Following a meeting with BPA/Prax the Applicant has agreed to carry out the modelling of the AC interference study to inform mitigation if required and will revert to BPA/Prax on the matter in due course. Discussion related to AC interference will carry on through the SoCG, which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The Applicant is looking to negotiate the form of protective provisions with BPA/Prax alongside these investigations.
	5	Failure to Engage Meaningfully Despite the critical nature of the infrastructure affected, the Applicant has not engaged in any meaningful technical dialogue with BPA or Prax prior to submission. This is contrary to the Government's guidance on linear infrastructure projects (published 27 February 2025), which emphasises the need for early, transparent and collaborative engagement with affected parties. This is especially critical in this case given that the infrastructure in question forms part of the Nationally significant fuel supply network.	The Applicant is engaging with BPA/Prax to agree a SoCG. This contains a full record of the engagement which has taken place between the Applicant and BPA/Prax, and sets out the areas of agreement, disagreement and matters which remain under discussion. The SoCG was provided to BPA/Prax on 22 December and comments on this are awaited. This will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. During the early stages of pre-application in October 2023, the Applicant team had a virtual meeting with BPA to provide the background information and initiate engagement. The Applicant team then had a virtual meeting with BPA in April 2025, during which details of the proposed Cable Corridor were shared, and BPA were able to provide their comments. Further to this, in response to a request from BPA/Prax in early June 2025, the Applicant's solicitors provided the shapefiles showing the locations and designs of how the Proposed Development is intended to cross the pipeline. Given the DCO Application was submitted on 18 July 2025, this demonstrates

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation
			that the Applicant sought to engage with BPA/Prax prior to the submission of the DCO Application. From June 2025, the Applicant's solicitors sought to obtain details of BPA/Prax's legal representatives in order to initiate discussions regarding protective provisions in relation to the pipeline. These details were received in August 2025, and the Applicant's solicitors initiated contact with their solicitors (Fieldfisher LLP) the next day, although did not receive any response until a "holding email" was received approximately two weeks later. It was then a further two months before the Applicant's solicitors received a substantive response from Fieldfisher LLP in November 2025. Although the Applicant team was unable to engage with Fieldfisher LLP prior to submission of the DCO Application, this was due to not receiving the details from BPA/Prax. However, as detailed above, the Applicant made attempts to engage with BPA/Prax with regards to the technical aspects of the Proposed Development, providing as much detail as was possible at the time, prior to submission of the DCO Application.
	6	Risk to National Infrastructure (and by extension the Environment) The Pipeline forms part of the Fina network, which supplies fuel to nationally significant sites including airports. Due to the fact that the crossing infrastructure is a high voltage cable and the Pipeline is made of steel, the proximity of the Project Works raises serious concerns regarding: 2.1 lack of modelling to assess safety and operational impacts; and 2.2 the potential for AC interference and stray currents from electrical infrastructure; and 2.3 the potential for accelerated corrosion of the Pipeline (which, if resulting in instability or rupture) would have a significant impact not only on the national fuel supply but also on the environment.	The Applicant notes this comment including the request for modelling of safety and operational impacts, the potential for AC interference and accelerated corrosion. The Applicant will liaise with BPA to address these points at the earliest possible stage. .
	7	Potentially Inadequate Order Limits Prax is a private pipeline owner. As such it only has limited property rights derived from its deeds of grant in respect of the Pipeline and cannot rely on the wide compulsory powers available to statutory operators. Therefore, if mitigation works are indeed needed to protect the Pipeline from damage and such works / rights fall outside the draft Order limits, then: 3.1 a change request would be needed to extend the Order limits; and 3.2 the draft Order would need to be amended to ensure that the necessary temporary and permanent property rights could be obtained pursuant to the Order and that the Applicant could devolve these to Prax and its successors in title.	As per Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, and the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** the Order Limits submitted for the Cable Corridor is sufficiently wide that the final route for the cable laying can be micro-sited during detailed design – this will enable the detailed design to integrate appropriate mitigation to allow for the crossing of the pipeline.
	8	Defective Environmental Statement 4.1 The crossing of the Pipeline and the potential risks flowing therefrom have not been addressed in the Environmental Statement as required by Regulations 4 and 5 and Schedule 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 4.2 If adequate mitigation works are not carried out (for example because these cannot be agreed or adequate land interests obtained) then there is significant risk of harm to the environment due to the potential that the Pipeline corrodes at an accelerated and unpredictable rate due to AC interference and there is a resultant fuel leak.	The potential interaction between the Pipeline and the Proposed Development has been considered within Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** – see paragraph 14.7.10 (g) which notes the consideration within the assessment of "*(g) The Finaline Killingholme to Buncefield underground fuel pipeline".* The assessment establishes the requirement for embedded mitigation to ensure adverse effects are avoided. As such the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1) notes the following commitment: *"To identify any existing infrastructure constraints, both consultation and a desk-based study will be undertaken prior to construction so that appropriate mitigation such as buffers can be incorporated into the design. Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) scans will also be used*

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation
		4.3 By failing to include this risk in the Environmental Statement, we would argue that it is ab initio defective.	*by Contractors to check for buried utilities prior to earth breaking site activities. The Applicant will endeavour to engage with utilities providers as appropriate."* The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** is to be developed into a detailed CEMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, secured under Requirement 12 (Construction environmental management plan) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It should be noted that a full clash detection exercise would be procured at the detailed design stage, when the design detail for the Proposed Development is more advanced. A concept design has been submitted as part of the DCO Application which incorporates spatial flexibility within the application parameters to account for if localised constraints are identified later in the process. The Applicant has agreed to carry out modelling to inform mitigation if required, and will discuss the findings of the modelling and any proposed mitigation with BPA.
	9	Inadequate Protective Provisions 5.1 The draft Order fails to include bespoke protective provisions for BPA/Prax. The only provisions currently included, relate to statutory operators. 5.2 Prax is, however, not a statutory operator. Adequate protective provisions must therefore be but in place so as to safeguard its ability to access, operate, repair, maintain and replace the Pipeline. BPA/Prax requires these to include provisions to ensure that: 5.2.1 Appropriate protective measures will be installed over any parts of the Pipeline, which could be crossed as a result of the Project Works; and 5.2.2 Works over and in the vicinity of the apparatus will be regulated to ensure compliance with health and safety requirements; and 5.2.3 There will be an agreed process governing any relocation of the Pipeline to ensure that it remains operational until the replacement apparatus is operational and all necessary replacement land rights have been granted); and 5.2.4 Any replacement rights to be provided are to be at least as extensive as those enjoyed for the existing apparatus; and 5.2.5 That all costs incurred by BPA and Prax in putting in place measures to protect their existing apparatus, or to relocate the Pipeline, will be met by the Applicant. 5.3 The importance of completing an overarching protective provisions agreement has been highlighted by the fact that it appears that not all of Prax's interests (including critical access and working rights) have in fact been identified and set out in the draft Order (please see clause 6 below)	The Applicant has engaged with BPA with the intention of agreeing protective provisions to safeguard BPA/Prax's ability to maintain and operate its pipeline infrastructure, as well as ensuring compliance with health and safety requirements. The Applicant acknowledges that BPA is not a statutory operator and will require bespoke protective provisions which will ensure their ability to access, operate, repair, maintain and replace the Pipeline is safeguarded. The Applicant intends to continue engaging with BPA to address their concerns, and specifically in relation to the concern of AC Interference. The Applicant has agreed to carry out the modelling of the AC interference to inform mitigation if required and will revert to BPA/Prax on the matter in due course. The Applicant is looking to negotiate the form of protective provisions with BPA/Prax alongside these investigations, and is also looking to agree a SoCG with BPA/Prax which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
	10	Procedural Deficiencies and Lack of Clarity 6.1 The Application does not correctly identify all affected land interests relevant to Prax in the Statement of Reasons. 6.2 The Statement of Reasons refers to 'Prax Downstream UK Limited' but should also refer to 'Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited' (in liquidation) (noting that if the Pipeline and/ or land interests are sold, the names will need to change). 6.3 The Application (and specifically the works' plans) do not include the information necessary for BPA/ Prax to assess and quantify: either 6.3.1 the potential risks of the Project Works / Cable installation (in their proposed form) on the Pipeline and whether these can be carried out safely; or	The Applicant acknowledges that Prax Downstream UK (PDUK) Limited and Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited has various interests in respect of rights and apparatus within the proposed Order Limits. Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited was not included in the Book of Reference submitted with the DCO Application as it was not a registered proprietor on the titles within the Order Limits. Furthermore, despite multiple chasers, the Applicant did not receive a completed LIQ from PDUK where such information could have been disclosed. The Applicant will include Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Limited in the next versions of the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and the Schedule of Negotiations and Powers Sought to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, and will continue to engage with the relevant estates team to ensure the application documents are accurate and up to date.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation
		6.3.2 to the extent that the Project Works / Cable installation can be carried out safely with appropriate mitigation what the proposed mitigation is and the data on which that assessment has been made.	Detail on the works and cable installation for the Proposed Development can be found in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, and the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]**. Following a meeting with BPA/Prax the Applicant has agreed to carry out the modelling of the AC interference study to inform mitigation if required and will revert to BPA/Prax on the matter in due course. As noted above, a full clash detection exercise would be procured at the detailed design stage, when the design detail for the Proposed Development is more precise. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1) notes the following commitment: *"To identify any existing infrastructure constraints, both consultation and a desk-based study will be undertaken prior to construction so that appropriate mitigation such as buffers can be incorporated into the design. Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) scans will also be used by Contractors to check for buried utilities prior to earth breaking site activities. The Applicant will endeavour to engage with utilities providers as appropriate."*
	11	Timing and Route Fixation The Application is now in the pre-examination phase. This severely limits the ability of affected parties to negotiate route changes or boundary adjustments. The Applicant's failure to engage earlier in respect of the key technical data has therefore prejudiced our client's ability to protect its interests effectively.	As detailed above, the Applicant is actively engaging with BPA/Prax to agree a SoCG which contains a full record of engagement. The SoCG is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The Applicant would like to emphasise that virtual meetings were held with BPA during the pre-application phase, during which technical points were discussed. BPA did not raise concerns in relation to the Proposed Development during these meetings, and nor did they provide any comments of this nature when the Applicant's solicitors provided the shapefiles for the Proposed Development in June 2025. Notice was issued to BPA under Section 42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 informing them of the statutory consultation in relation to the Proposed Development. Further details of the consultation are described in the Consultation Report **[APP-023]**. The Applicant cannot compel any parties to engage in statutory consultation, but the Consultation Report and its accompanying appendices set out how the Applicant responded to feedback that was received both during statutory consultation and non-statutory consultation. The Applicant's solicitors are actively engaging with BPA/Prax's solicitors in order to negotiate protective provisions in relation to the Proposed Development. Following a recent meeting between the Applicant team and BPA/Prax and their solicitors, the Applicant has agreed to carry out the modelling of the AC interference study to ensure that any mitigation has been appropriately informed, and the outcome of which will determine the level of detail required and the points to be addressed in the proposed protective provisions. Additionally, the Applicant would like to remind BPA/Prax that the Proposed Development has not yet reached the detailed design stage. This is be undertaken post-consent. Therefore, there is an element of flexibility in the Proposed Development design (within the confines of the Proposed Development Parameters and the limits of deviation).
	12	Potential consequences on the Pipeline of the draft Order being confirmed in its current form	The Applicant is committed to continual engagement with BPA/Prax to agree bespoke protective provisions for inclusion in the draft Order during the course of the examination period – it should be noted that the Applicant is looking to agree a SoCG with BPA, which includes the points raised in the BPA/ PRAX RR. The SoCG is currently under preparation and will be submitted at

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation
		8.1 In the absence of an agreement on protective provisions, if the draft Order is confirmed in its current form and Prax's existing rights are extinguished, the Applicant will be in a position to prevent Prax from continuing to access, operate, repair replace or maintain its Pipeline; and 8.2 This could have significant economic impacts not only on BPA as operator and Prax as owner of the Pipeline but also on the relevant airports and business dependent on this fuel including impacts on levels of local employment. As a result, the compensation costs could be significant. 8.3 It is not clear whether these significant costs, which could be incurred if Prax's operations in the area were impeded or unable to continue, have been provided for in the funding for the draft Order. 8.4 BPA as operator and Prax as owner of the Pipeline are subject to continuous statutory and regulatory health and safety regulations (including but not limited to the Pipe-lines Act 1962 and the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996). These require 24/7 access to the Pipeline. If the Applicant acquires Prax's rights in relation to the Pipeline, Prax and BPA may no longer be able to safely operate and retain the Pipeline.	the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**. The Applicant acknowledges the importance of agreeing bespoke protective provisions to protect BPA/Prax's ability to operate and maintain its pipeline, and is supportive of agreeing protective provisions that will safeguard the pipeline. Based on the available information, the Applicant does not intend to extinguish BPA/Prax's rights in respect of its apparatus. In relation to BPA/Prax's comment on funding for the Proposed Development, the Department for Housing, Communities and Local Government "Planning Act 2008 - Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land" dated September 2013, at paragraph 17 provides that, "any application for a consent order authorising compulsory acquisition must be accompanied by a statement explaining how it will be funded. This statement should provide as much information as possible about the resource implications of both acquiring the land and implementing the project for which the land is required." The Applicant has submitted its Funding Statement **[AS-014]** and paragraph 1.3.1 sets out the Applicant's current estimate of the costs of the Proposed Development, including costs associated with land acquisition and compulsory acquisition compensation. The Applicant is not currently aware of any reason by which any compulsory acquisition compensation, if payable, couldn't be covered by the estimate included in the Funding Statement **[AS-014]**. The Funding Statement **[AS-014]** also includes the financial statements of the Applicant's shareholders, demonstrating that it has access to sufficient funds to implement the Proposed Development. The Applicant is also aware of the need for BPA/Prax to have the same rights and powers over its infrastructure to ensure that their ability to protect and operate the Pipeline is not impaired.
	13	Request to the Applicant 9.1 BPA requests that the Applicant: 9.2.1 enters into immediate technical dialogue with BPA/Prax; and 9.2.2 provides detailed modelling and mitigation proposals for the Project Works and specifically the effect of the energization of the Cable on the ongoing operation and safety and stability of the Pipeline; and 9.2.3 placeholder bespoke protective provisions to benefit BPA/ Prax bespoke protective provisions are agreed and incorporated into the draft Order pending agreement	The Applicant has engaged with BPA/Prax in an all-parties meeting to discuss the issues raised in this Relevant Representation. A technical dialogue has been opened between the Applicant's project team and BPA/Prax, and the Applicant has agreed to carry out modelling on AC Interference as part of this dialogue. Protective provisions have also been discussed, and the parties have agreed that these will be progressed, albeit the outcome of the AC modelling interference will determine the level of detail and content required in the protective provisions.
	14	Conclusion 10.1 Our client does not object to the principle of the development but cannot support the application in its current form for the reasons set out above; 10.2 As set out in the First Relevant Representations and above, Prax is (due to the PLOR liquidation) only at the beginning of its investigations into this matter; 10.3 BPA and Prax have to date not received any meaningful plot specific information which would enable even a general assessment as to whether the Project Works and energization of the Cable, as planned, could be carried out safely; 10.4 As such, BPA/Prax cannot support the draft Order in its current form and would ask the Planning Inspectorate not to submit the draft Order for approval until BPA's legitimate concerns	Following a meeting with BPA/Prax the Applicant has agreed to carry out the modelling of the AC interference to inform mitigation and will revert to BPA/Prax on the matter in due course. Discussion related to AC interference will carry on through the SoCG which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision of 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation	Response to British Pipeline Agency Limited for Two Prax Entities Relevant Representation
		have been addressed and the Pipeline has been adequately safeguarded and protective provisions agreed. 10.5 BPA/Prax therefore continue to reserve the right to make further representations during the examination process.	

5.6 Cliff Villages Solar Action Group

Table 5-6: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Cliff Villages Solar Action Group

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representation	Response to Cliff Villages Solar Action Group Relevant Representation
RR-064	1	Very prominent from the Cliff edge, a protected area. Changes the nature of the landscape from farmland to industrial solar, damaging the setting of the Viking Way and of our rural villages.	The Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development in its pursuit of securing good design, as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. The Applicant acknowledges the potential for adverse effects on the landscape character of the Lincoln Cliff and the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way resulting from the Proposed Development. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** concludes that the Proposed Development will have a minor adverse (not significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to no effect (not significant) by Year 1 of operation (in winter) on the Landscape Character Type (LCT): Lincoln Cliff and Sub-area 6: Lincoln Cliff. The assessment also established that the Proposed Development will have a moderate adverse (significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to minor adverse (not significant) by Year 1 of operation (in winter) and no effect by Year 15 of operation (in winter) on the Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA): Lincoln Cliff. With regards to the Viking Way (Viewpoints 15 and 13 respectively - PRoW BooG/2/2 and PRoW Cole/2/1), Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** establishes a moderate adverse (significant) visual effect during construction (winter) reducing to minor adverse (not significant) in Years 1 and 15 (winter). As such, significant adverse landscape and visual effects at these receptors would be in the short term during construction; there are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on residents of local villages, the Lincoln Cliff LCT, Sub-area 6: Lincoln Cliff and Lincoln Cliff LLCA, as, by Year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping would have matured such that views of solar PV infrastructure within the Site would be sufficiently screened. With regards to the cumulative assessment, during operation (year 15) there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development in isolation, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development in combination with other relevant schemes. The Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1), paragraph 5.10.5 recognises the potential implications of energy infrastructure projects with regards to landscape and visual impact, where it states that *"virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation."* When determining the DCO Application, the Secretary of State will need to balance the impacts of the Proposed Development, such as landscape and visual impacts, against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in the energy NPSs.

5.7 Forestry Commission

Table 5-7: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Forestry Commission

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Forestry Commission Relevant Representation	Response to Forestry Commission Relevant Representation
RR-091	1	Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission on this application. As a Non-Ministerial Government Department, the Forestry Commission provide no opinion supporting or objecting to an application. Rather we provide advice on the potential impact that the proposed development could have on trees and woodland, including ancient woodland.	The Applicant thanks the Forestry Commission for their contribution thus far and looks forward to working with them.
	2	The site is directly adjacent to Tunman/Housham Woods Plantation on an Ancient Woodland (PAWS) site, it is also directly adjacent to Stocking Wood Mixed Deciduous Priority Habitat Woodland. There are also fragmented mixed deciduous woodlands adjacent to the site that whilst they are not within the site, would be contained by it. We note that 126 veteran trees and 2 ancient trees have been identified within or adjacent to the site. There are also two areas of grant funded woodland within the site boundary.	The Applicant notes the Forestry Commission's assessment of the site location.
	3	Potential Impacts and relevant policy: <u>Ancient Woodland:</u> Ancient woodlands are an irreplaceable habitat. They have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, being continuously wooded since at least 1600AD with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies equally to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS). Section 5.4.53 of EN1 – The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy states: "The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of any irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland, and ancient and veteran trees unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists." We would particularly refer you to further technical information set out in Natural England and Forestry Commission's Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland – plus supporting Assessment Guide and "Keepers of Time" – Ancient and Native Woodland and Trees Policy in England. The Standing Advice states that proposals should have a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of ancient woodlands to avoid loss or deterioration of the woodland. Where assessment shows impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, you're likely to need a larger buffer zone. For example, the effect of air pollution from development that can result from a significant increase in traffic or dust from construction. The Standing Advice and the recommended buffer zones are currently under review and are likely to be updated recommending that the minimum buffer requirement will be increased. There is a need to consider both the direct and indirect impacts of the development. Direct impacts can include, but are not limited to, damaging or compacting soil, damaging functional habitat connections and changing the woodland ecosystem by removing the woodland edge or thinning trees. Indirect impacts can also include reducing the amount of semi-natural habitats next to ancient woodland, increasing the amount of dust, light, air or soil pollution, changing the landscape character of the area or severing habitat connections, which could cause habitat degradation. Due to the irreplaceable nature of ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees, most temporary effects will result in irreplaceable damage. We note the documents state that all of the woodlands adjacent to the site will be afforded a minimum 15m buffer, the exact size of this buffer is unclear. In our view there is reasonable doubt that that deterioration of the ancient woodlands could still occur as a result of the	<u>Ancient Woodland</u> The Applicant notes the request for a 30m buffer to ancient woodland. The 30m buffer is not considered necessary in this instance – as detailed in Appendix 10-H Arboricultural Impact Assessment of the ES **[APP-155]** and the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** the Proposed Development design adopts the minimum 15m buffer for ancient woodland identified by the latest version of the Natural England and Forestry Commissions standing advice and therefore it is compliant with current guidance. However, where possible the solar infrastructure in the vicinity of Tunman/Housham Woods is sited more than the minimum 15m buffer from the ancient woodland boundary. Access locations and routes are proposed to utilise existing farm access routes and hedge breaks to avoid or reduce arboricultural impacts and are sited over 25m from the ancient woodland boundary. As a consequence of using existing accesses for construction (therefore avoiding adverse effects associated with the creation of additional accesses, such as additional hedgerow removal works), two of the proposed access routes will be located within 20m of the ancient woodland, but in excess of the minimum 15m buffer. Aside from access routes, the nearest element of the Proposed Development would be security fencing which would be achieved via driven timber posts positioned outside the minimum 15m buffer. Lighting and security cameras would also be installed (requiring a shallow trench for cabling). The installation and operation of the fencing, lighting and security cameras will have very minimal impact on soil structure and will increase the protection of the woodland beyond the current situation. The current management of the land includes regular ploughing in proximity and potentially the use of fertilisers which can affect the nutrient status and biodiversity value of soils within the woodland. Any excavation for cabling (for security cameras and lighting) would be localised, with disturbance comparative to that achieved via ploughing, although on a much less extensive scale. The individual trees within the woodland edge have been considered and have been recorded individually where appropriate which demonstrates the 15m minimum buffer is sufficient to protect the Root Protection Area of trees from direct damage.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Forestry Commission Relevant Representation	Response to Forestry Commission Relevant Representation
		proposed development if they are only afforded a 15m minimum buffer, especially considering that the development will almost enclose these woodlands on three sides. The minimum buffer would be more suited to a small scale development. It is our opinion that a 30m buffer would provide a suitable mitigation for any potential affects to the ancient woodlands, assuming that all other protection measures including the use of construction exclusion zones, dust minimization, directional lighting to avoid illuminating the woodlands and pollution control measures are utilized.	Beyond the security fence there would typically be a grassed strip of circa 5m for occasional access/maintenance (located on land currently regularly cultivated) before the solar PV panel locations (which would be supported on driven or screwed steel piles). The use of driven or screwed supports will have minimal impact on the soil structure given that this method avoids excavation and displacement of large volumes of soil (the volume displaced is roughly only the pile shaft volume) and as such conserves the existing soil layering and structure beyond the immediate vicinity of the pile, minimising long-term alteration to soil structure. Air pollution and dust are unlikely to be an issue given the nature of the development and construction requirements and are not likely to exceed the level of dust or pollution associated with the arable farm practices currently applied to the site. Because soils will not be disturbed by regular ploughing or harvesting (as they currently are) but will be protected via turf, potential negative impacts associated with dust are likely to be reduced. The Air Quality Assessment included within Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** (see Section 14.2) screened out emissions entirely due to the very low level of operational use anticipated for access tracks. The Proposed Development post-construction will increase the area of generally undisturbed ground within or near to the ancient woodland minimum buffer and will likely represent an improvement to soil conditions in this location. On this basis the application of an overarching 30m buffer for ancient woodland is not considered to be justified.
	4	Ancient and Veteran Trees: Ancient and veteran trees are also irreplaceable habitats. The Joint NE/FC Standing Advice states that for or ancient or veteran trees the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area. The Root Protection Zone (as specified in British Standard 5837) is there to protect the roots of trees, which often spread out further than the tree canopy. Protection measures include taking care not to cut tree roots (e.g., by trenching) or causing soil compaction around trees (e.g., through vehicle movements or stacking heavy equipment) or contamination from poisons (e.g., site stored fuel or chemicals). It is noted that while no ancient or veteran trees are planned to be removed, five of the veteran trees will experience construction traffic access through their RPA's, one of which (T572) may be severely affected as the access is currently a grass track. It is our view, habitat deterioration to these irreplaceable habitats is likely to occur if construction occurs within the RPA's, particularly for access roads which may potentially carry heavy equipment. Due to the irreplaceable nature of ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees, most temporary effects will result in irreplaceable damage. The RPA should be avoided and protected, especially in the cases where there is likely to be frequent construction traffic where roots are particularly vulnerable to compaction and there will be an increase in air pollution. Any effect from the incursion into RPA's of veteran trees may not become immediately apparent and will need to be extensively monitored, even after construction.	Ancient and Veteran Trees As noted in paragraph 3.4.5 of Appendix 10-H: Arboricultural Impact Assessment of the ES **[APP-155]**, the arboriculture assessment has been carried out in accordance with the general principles of the Natural England & Forestry Commission. (2022, January 14). Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions. Paragraph 5.3.2 of Appendix 10-H: Arboricultural Impact Assessment of the ES **[APP-155]** notes: "*The standing advice recommends a minimum buffer zone from development activities set as 15 times the stem diameter (or the canopy extent + 5m, whichever is greater) to be applied to ancient and veteran individual trees*", which has been implemented as part of the assessment. As stated in Section 6.6.22 of Appendix 10-H: Arboricultural Impact Assessment of the ES **[APP-155]** there will be no change of use for the access roads (e.g. no change in width, height or ground loading from vehicle use) located adjacent to four of the five veteran trees. No construction work will occur within the RPAs of these trees. The access roads will be used in keeping with their current use. This will adequately protect tree roots and soil structure and will not result in a material increase in air pollution or dust. The 'grass track' adjacent to T572 is named on the County Series map of 1886 as Moreton Lane indicating that it is a long-established access route. It appears to be formed of hard standing but has been overgrown in places. This access route will be for emergency access only and therefore minimal use is anticipated. Due to uncertainty in relation to the build-up of the existing track a precautionary approach is proposed which would reinforce the existing track using a floating three-dimensional cellular confinement system to ensure the soil below the existing track is not compacted (and no roots are impacted). There will be no requirement for excavation below the track, and the proposed additional material will be situated solely within the footprint of the existing track. The emergency use of the track is likely to be of such a low frequency that any vehicular emissions or dust are unlikely to have a negative impact on the tree or its associated

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Forestry Commission Relevant Representation	Response to Forestry Commission Relevant Representation
			niche habitats. The Applicant acknowledges the comment from the Forestry Commission regarding monitoring in this instance with regards to T572, where there is a level of uncertainty regarding the build-up of this access track. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** notes (ref. ARB-C1) "*The final specification for mitigation measures will be detailed in the Arboricultural Method Statement"*, whereby any monitoring requirement would be captured as part of this Arboricultural Method Statement. For clarity, measure ARB-C1 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Measure ARB-C1 now reads: *"The existing access road adjacent to T572 (see Appendix 10-H: Arboricultural Impact Assessment of the ES **[EN01054/APP/6.3]**) is considered to be an informal grass track and due to the anticipated high frequency of use from construction traffic mitigation measures will be required. Mitigation measures are likely to include the use of a three-dimensional cellular raft system to prevent negative impacts to the structure of the soil within the RPA. The Arboricultural Method Statement will set out any requirements with regards to the monitoring of T572 as relevant."* Construction impacts such as dust will be managed as detailed in an Arboricultural Method Statement, to be produced as part of the detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ARB-C1), as secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	5	Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat: There are several fragmented areas of mixed deciduous woodland adjacent to the order area, some of which would be completely enclosed by the development. Mixed Deciduous woodlands are on the National Forest Inventory and the Priority Habitat Inventory (England). They were recognized under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan as being the most threatened, requiring conservation action. The UK Biodiversity Action Plan has now been superseded but this priority status remains under the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006. (NERC) Sect 40 "Duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity" and Sect 41 – "List of habitats and species of principle importance in England". Fragmentation is one of the greatest threats to mixed deciduous woodland. Loss of habitat connectivity is a particular concern where the woodland would become isolated in its landscape and surrounded by development on several sides. These woodlands can also suffer loss or deterioration from nearby development through damage to soils, roots and vegetation and changes to drainage and air pollution from an increase in traffic and dust, particularly during the construction phase of a development.	Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat: Potential impacts associated with the fragmentation and deterioration of woodland habitats as a result of construction (including damage to soils, roots and vegetation and changes to drainage and air pollution from an increase in traffic and dust) are assessed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** (ref. page 8-144). The assessment concludes no potential effect upon woodland habitats, stating *"There will be no direct impact on this habitat; no fragmentation of habitats, or of populations of species using habitats and no species mortality of any species associated with woodland habitats. Embedded mitigation measures (see Table 8-13), formalised in the Framework CEMP **[EN010154/APP/7.7]** will ensure there are no impact pathways that will affect the integrity or functioning of this habitat, including ensuring appropriate buffers from construction adjacent to this habitat and pollution control. Should the detailed design route any cables through trees or woodland that are being retained, they will installed via HDD at least 2m beneath the ground surface in order to protect the tree roots. Therefore, there are no impact pathways, either directly or indirectly, that would impact upon the integrity or functioning of woodland habitats."*
	6	Grant Funded Woodland: It should be noted that there are two areas within the site that show on our map system that they were established or managed with the support of public money in the form of the Farm Woodland Premium Scheme (FWPS). These will need to be assessed to check the status of these grants. They appear to still be in 'obligation'. The obligation period can last for up to thirty years from the date the first instalment of grant was paid. The landowner is expected to meet all of the Terms and Conditions of the agreement contract. Failure to do so is likely to require the Forestry Commission to seek to recover all of the relevant grant that has been paid to avoid public money being wasted.	Grant Funded Woodland The Applicant understands that the two areas of Farm Woodland Premium Scheme (FWPS) within the Order Limits noted by the Forestry Commission comprise: - FWPS Case Ref: 7419; Property Name 13FWP000919-24/049/009; Status Date 17/12/1999; Approx 1.5ha plot of grant area of 3.19ha; Location: SK 9115 6206; and - FWPS Case Ref: 7740; Property Name 13FWP001327-24/069/0014; Status Date 07/01/2023; 1.20ha; Location: TF 0071 5782. It should be noted that the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** includes the following commitment (ref. ECO-C1): *"(h) Should the detailed design route any cables through trees or woodland that are being retained, they will be installed via HDD at least 2m beneath the ground surface in order to protect the tree roots."* – this is particularly relevant to the area of woodland north-east of Thurlby (FWPS Ref: 7419) whereby the Works Plans **[AS-105]** allow for interconnecting cables (Work

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Forestry Commission Relevant Representation	Response to Forestry Commission Relevant Representation
			No.6) across this land. Also, as illustrated in the Figure 3-17: Maximum Vegetation Removal Plan of the ES **[AS-029]**, no removal within these areas of FRPS is proposed/anticipated. Furthermore, the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 4.1.14) includes the requirement for undeveloped offsets of at least 15m from woodlands and the Proposed Development, thereby avoiding any direct impact on these habitat types. As such, the Proposed Development will not impact upon these two areas of FWPS.
	7	Tree and Woodland Planting: We note that landscape plans appear to include the planting of approximately 200 trees and there is mention of woodland planting and tree belts. However it is unclear from the landscape mitigation where these woodland tree belts are likely to be, or whether they are included in the 200 trees figure. Section 4.3.20 of EN1 – The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy states: "The Government has set 13 legally binding targets for England under the Environment Act 2021, covering the areas of: biodiversity; air quality; water; resource efficiency and waste reduction; tree and woodland cover; and Marine Protected Areas. Meeting the legally binding targets will be a shared endeavour that will require a whole of government approach to delivery. The Secretary of State have regard to the ambitions, goals and targets set out in the Government's Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 for improving the natural environment and heritage. This includes having regard to the achievement of statutory targets set under the Environment Act." As stated in the Environmental Improvement Plan 2023, it is a strategic government objective to increase the net area of tree canopy and woodland cover to 16.5% of total land area in England by 2050. It goes on to state that that increasing tree cover is key to achieving the Net Zero Strategy and species abundance targets. Whilst the application states tree planting will occur on site, this does not reflect an increase in canopy cover, particularly in the short to medium term. It is important that woodland creation is not just used as screening at strategic locations and ensures habitat connectivity throughout the landscape. Habitat connectivity could be improved across the site with further woodland creation, between existing woodland blocks to link them and ensure maximum gains to increase habitat connectivity across the site to avoid habitat fragmentation. Woodland creation in the area between Stocking Wood and Housham (PAWS) Woodland would be particularly beneficial. The species and provenance of all new trees and woodland also needs to be considered to ensure a resilient treescape which can cope with the full implications of a changing climate. This also applies to all woodland areas, including retained woodlands to be enhanced. With a changing climate, a wide species selection will be beneficial, mixed woodland is usually of maximum benefit for habitat provision. Use of the Forestry Commission Ecological Site Classification Tool (ESC) can assist with selection of tree species that are ecologically suited to particular sites and includes climate change predictions to allow for future suitability and woodland resilience. The biosecurity of all planting stock also needs to be considered to avoid the introduction of pests and diseases, particularly in areas where there are ancient woodlands. We would recommend trees are sourced from plant healthy certified nurseries. It is noted some of the documentation mentions planned areas of natural woodland regeneration in buffer areas around the existing woodlands, although this does not appear to be mentioned in the Landscape Mitigation Plan. It is also stated that there are no plans for ongoing management of these areas, although tree and woodland management is mentioned as planned elsewhere in the documents.	Tree and Woodland Planting As detailed in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** the Proposed Development planting design includes approximately 16km of new native hedgerows, over 200 new trees, approximately 20ha of species rich grassland (outside of Solar PV areas), approximately 83ha of permanent grassland for bird mitigation purposes and approximately 1.8ha of community orchard. The locations of the new woodland and tree belts are shown on the Landscape Mitigation Plan in Figure 7.15-1 in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, whereby the total number of trees (over 200) is inclusive of tree belt planting. Proposed woodland and tree belts will be established to introduce new areas of woodland, provide screening in sensitive areas, increase canopy cover, and provide better connectivity and habitat for local wildlife. As stated in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.5 - 7.1.8), the Contractor, appointed by the Applicant to construct the Proposed Development, will be responsible for establishing, managing, and monitoring the implementation of landscape and ecological mitigation during the five-year establishment aftercare period. The Applicant will inspect and record the success of this establishment during that time. A post-construction monitoring programme will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP. Walkover surveys of the Order Limits will be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. The surveys will involve inspection of the hedgerows, tree belt and trees, and grassland habitats to ensure they are being managed accordingly. The implementation of these management measures alongside the planting proposed will aid the strategic government objectives noted in the comment. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** is to be developed into a detailed LEMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. As shown on the Landscape Mitigation Plan in Figure 7.15-1 in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. Sheet 1 of 16), although not woodland creation, new hedgerows are proposed between Stocking Wood and Housham Woodland which will improve habitat connectivity. Species will be chosen to build in resilience and will consider the requirements of the local area, taking into account climate change and potential pest and pathogen threats. Native species will form the majority of the tree stock, while specially selected non-natives may be used to build in resilience in the face of climate change. A specification for proposed woodland and tree belts will be developed at detailed design post-consent, in line with the indicative species, sizes, and percentages outlined in Table 1 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. Section 5.3 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** details the proposed habitats, their function, implementation, establishment and long-term maintenance. A detailed plan for the establishment and maintenance of new trees will be submitted within an Arboricultural Method Statement (secured by the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, ref. ARB-C1). Additionally, the existing individual trees, shrubs and woodland (including hedgerow trees) will be managed to provide longevity, increase species diversity, enhance habitat value and improve

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Forestry Commission Relevant Representation	Response to Forestry Commission Relevant Representation
		Natural regeneration is supported by the Forestry Commission, providing there is sufficient seed source within 75m and that there is a sufficient variety of species. If not, enrichment planting may be required.	resilience to climate change. This will include the gapping up of existing hedgerows, where appropriate, to boost species and age diversity, providing better connectivity and increasing the number of climate and disease resilient species. During construction the retained vegetation will be protected. Measures to be employed will include the use of clearly defined stand-offs, managing the structure and integrity of the retained vegetation, and undertaking any pruning outside of the bird breeding season and in accordance with hedgerow regulations. Further detail of the management of existing habitat, and implementation, establishment and management of new habitat will be detailed in the detailed LEMP and CEMP to be developed during detailed design post-consent. With regards to the biosecurity of planting stock, as noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 5.3.2), plants will be inspected by the Landscape Clerk of Works (LCoW) at the nursery and on delivery to Site prior to planting. Furthermore, as stated in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ECO-C11), a Biosecurity Management Plan will be produced which will set out procedures to ensure that no invasive non-native plant species are brought onto the Order Limits (e.g., Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) Schedule 9 species) and will be formalised in the detailed CEMP, the provision of which, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. In the event that any future infestations of INNS are identified prior to and or during the development process, exclusion zones will be established around them, and an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) contacted for advice as required. Regarding natural woodland regeneration areas, the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 4.1.14) commits to a minimum offset (i.e. buffer) of 15m from woodlands, whereby Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** (ref. paragraph 8.13.9) notes that woodland will be encouraged to naturally regenerate within these areas. For clarity, the long-term management of woodland and tree belts set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 5.3.11) has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 5.3.11 now includes: *"Buffer areas around existing woodland will be encouraged to naturally regenerate where feasible."*
	8	The management of the impacts from deer would also need to be considered to prevent deer browsing off new saplings. Once the canopy closes, management would be vital to maintain species and structural diversity and to maximise biodiversity benefits. Well managed, diverse and vital woodlands are more resilient to disease and climate change and support a greater diversity of animal and plant species, as well as having more visual interest for people. Lack of long term management not only leads to declines in structure and biodiversity but also reduces the speed and amount of carbon storage. Woodland creation is a good way of reducing the green house gas emissions associated with the development and decommissioning of energy projects. Access will also need to be considered for future management. As a large scale project, this proposal has scope to exclude significant amounts of farmland from the deer range in this area. This is likely to increase herbivore browsing and grazing to other areas in close proximity to the site. Impacts are likely to increase in surrounding woodlands and the wider landscape, where ancient woodlands, hedgerows and stewardship schemes are likely to be impacted upon. Large scale fencing will change how deer move through the landscape, which may also increase the numbers of deer crossing local roads and therefore may also increase the numbers of deer vehicle collisions in the area. An assessment of any increase of this risk should be undertaken, if culls occur prior to development, the risks should reduce.	Protection of newly planted trees and scrub from grazing will be carried out with spiral tree guards, and fencing design will ensure habitat permeability with offsets from roads, suitable gaps for mammals as well as unfenced areas as stated in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** and the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. Section 5.3 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** details the proposed habitats, their function, implementation, establishment and long-term maintenance. A detailed plan for the establishment and maintenance of new trees will be submitted within an Arboricultural Method Statement (secured by the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, ref ARB-C1). With regards to potential deer vehicle collisions, all security perimeter fencing will include gaps to allow small/medium sized mammals (including deer) to pass underneath at strategic locations to maintain ecological connectivity, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (e.g. ref. ECO-C1). The final locations of these mammal passes will be determined following pre-commencement surveys. Existing hedgerows and wildlife corridors will also be retained outside of the security perimeter, to allow the continued movement of mammals across the landscape. With the implementation of such mitigation secured by the management plans submitted with the DCO Application (e.g. Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**), Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Forestry Commission Relevant Representation	Response to Forestry Commission Relevant Representation
			Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** concludes that there would be no effect upon 'other mammals' (i.e. inclusive of deer) (ref. Table 8-15).
	9	Avoiding impacts and good landscape design: To meet planning policy and Government guidance, we would recommend: • Robust adherence to the Standing Advice, especially regarding buffer zones, to rule out loss or deterioration to the ancient woodlands or ancient and veteran trees. • Detailed plans for protection measures for the woodlands during the construction. • Maintain and where possible improve woodland condition, especially ancient woodland. • Utilise biodiversity gains as part of avoiding woodland and tree impacts (especially ancient/veteran) which can also maximise biodiversity benefits by embracing irreplaceable and high priority habitats – for example focussing on ecological enhancements/creation of woodland edges. • Woodland creation and improvements to ecological connectivity. For example, there are potential opportunities to link fragmented woodland habitats across the site, which will increase habitat connectivity, making woodlands more resilient and benefitting biodiversity across the project area. • Overall increase in the tree canopy cover to contribute to the Government's target to increase tree and canopy cover to 16.5% of land area in England by 2050. • A UK Forestry Standard compliant woodland management plan, including deer and squirrel control, is created to ensure the long term maintenance of all new and existing woodland within the site. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.	Avoiding impacts and good landscape design: The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Appendix 10-H: Arboricultural Impact Assessment of the ES **[APP-155]**, and Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** detail how the Proposed Development has considered ancient woodland buffer zones, habitat implementation, establishment and management measures, biodiversity net gain, ecological connectivity and woodland management. Further detail on the above will be provided during detailed design post-consent within the detailed LEMP (which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), detailed CEMP (which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**) and an Arboricultural Method Statement secured by the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**.

5.8 Lincolnshire Against Needless Destruction

Table 5-8: Applicant's Responses to Non-Statutory Organisation's Relevant Representations: Lincolnshire Against Needless Destruction

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Lincolnshire Against Needless Destruction Relevant Representation	Response to Lincolnshire Against Needless Destruction Relevant Representation
RR-156	1	Our preliminary concerns are the cumulative impact of excessive energy infrastructure within Lincolnshire. We scrutinise the plans of each project and look at the impact on each area including input from members of community.	The Applicant acknowledges that there is the potential for Cumulative Effects as a result of the combined impact of the Proposed Development together with other energy schemes proposed in the area and recognises local concerns regarding the concentration of energy developments in Lincolnshire. A detailed cumulative effects assessment has been provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the Environmental Statement **[APP-040]**. The short list of cumulative developments, inclusive of the relevant energy infrastructure proposals in the area, has been agreed with NKDC and LCC. The agreed short list of cumulative developments is provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. Table 15-8). The cumulative effects assessment followed a staged approach and considered relevant developments and land allocations within a 10km radius from the Proposed Development. A wider county level study area was used for the cumulative effects assessment in relation to BMV Agricultural Land which considers other Solar NSIPs within the County of Lincolnshire. As summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. paragraph 15.5.24), significant adverse cumulative effects are identified on landscape and visual amenity receptors, however the significance of effect attributed to the Proposed Development alone is not increased when considering these other developments alongside the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The following significant cumulative effects were established during construction, where the magnitude of effect is higher than that of the Proposed Development in isolation. During construction: • Major Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects upon the North Kesteven District landscape sub-area Witham and Brant Vales due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction. Additionally, changes are anticipated to the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way (PRoW Cole/2/1 and BooG/2/2) as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID95 Application Reference: PL/0087/23, North Hykeham Relief Road, resulting in a Major adverse effect which is significant. • Moderate Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects on the North Kesteven landscape sub-area Limestone Heath due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID63 Application Reference: EN010149, Springwell Energy Farm and ID103 Application Reference: EN0110016, Leoda Solar Farm, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect which is significant. During operation (year 15) it is considered there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes has also been considered within Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton **[EN010132]**, and Cottam **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that,

			given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects.

6. Applicant's Responses to People with an Interest in the Land's Relevant Representations

6.1 People with an Interest in the Land

Table 6-1: Applicant's Responses to People with an Interest in the Land's Relevant Representations

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
RR-007 RR-183	1	I am writing to object to the proposed Fosse Green Energy development. While I fully support renewable energy in principle, this proposal represents an inappropriate scale and location for industrial infrastructure, in a sensitive rural area close to my home in Norton Disney. The project would have significant negative consequences for the local environment, community wellbeing, and day-to-day quality of life. Landscape and Visual Harm The proposed development would spread across vast areas of farmland north and south of the A46, surrounding the villages of Norton Disney, Thorpe-on-the-Hill, Witham St Hughs, Haddington, Thurlby, Navenby, and Bassingham. For local residents, including myself, the change from open countryside to a fenced industrial landscape of solar arrays, CCTV towers, and security lighting would be visually intrusive and oppressive. The loss of rural views, particularly along public rights of way and country lanes, would diminish the sense of place and tranquillity that define daily life here. During and after construction, the area would feel industrialised rather than rural — a profound and permanent change to the living environment. Impact on Daily Life and Residential Amenity This proposal would affect my everyday living conditions in several ways: Traffic and safety: Construction will bring a large increase in HGVs, service vehicles, and worker traffic through narrow local roads around Norton Disney. This raises safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders, and children. Increased traffic, noise, and vibration would disturb the quiet character of the area and make daily travel more stressful. Noise and disturbance: Machinery, pile-driving, and site traffic during construction — potentially for several years — will create continuous background noise. Even once operational, inverters and cooling systems may produce a low-frequency hum perceptible in calm weather. Dust and air quality: Earthworks and heavy construction traffic will generate dust that can settle on homes, cars, gardens, and crops, particularly during dry months. Lighting and security systems: 24-hour security lighting and camera systems risk light pollution at night, affecting sleep quality and dark-sky views. Mental and physical wellbeing: The countryside setting contributes directly to residents' mental health and quality of life. The industrialisation of the landscape would cause loss of amenity and sense of wellbeing for local people who value peaceful outdoor recreation and views of open farmland.	Landscape and Visual Amenity The Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development in its pursuit of securing good design as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse effects on the visual amenity of surrounding villages resulting from the Proposed Development, as detailed within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[APP-035]**, but considers that these would only be in the short to medium term during construction and the early years of operation. There are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on residents of local villages as, by year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping would have matured such that views of solar PV infrastructure within the Principal Site would be screened. While the Proposed Development covers a large site area, its scale has been informed by a comprehensive, iterative design process that has sought to minimise landscape and visual effects, developed and refined in response to consultation feedback from statutory consultees, local stakeholders and persons with land interest, with such engagement helping to shape the layout and approach to land use to minimise environmental impacts. The Proposed Development does not physically surround any village, the individual areas of proposed infrastructure are located at varying distances from settlements and are separated by existing landscape features, agricultural land, and new planting. Although nearby villages lie in relative proximity to parts of the Proposed Development, the Proposed Development has been designed such that it does not physically surround any of these villages. Instead, each village retains separation from the Principal Site by intervening farmland, existing landscape features and new mitigation planting. While the Proposed Development comprises infrastructure for solar energy generation and associated development (such as BESS), the land is not permanently changed to industrial use in land use planning terms, and it should be noted that the Proposed Development also includes a significant amount of retained arable land. The design of the Proposed Development has sought to minimise impacts upon agricultural land, as explained in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** which sets out the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution – Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land. This has been achieved through the retention of a significant quantum of arable land within the Order Limits (the DCO commits to 181 ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, whereby a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**).). This retained arable land within the Order Limits disperses the areas of solar PV array and affords ecological and economic benefits associated with habitat for nesting birds and retained jobs. Impact on Daily Life and Residential Amenity <u>Traffic and Safety</u> An assessment of the potential effects relating to additional construction traffic, including on safety, is set out within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legislation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A of the ES **[APP-163]**. This concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. The assessment has used the shortest expected construction programme (24 months), which provides a worst-case scenario in terms of construction vehicle trips as this is based on a rapid, and so shorter, construction period that would generate the highest number of peak hour and daily road trips on the local network. LCC and National Highways in their

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		In planning terms, these are material impacts on amenity, tranquillity, and the character of the area.	capacities of being responsible for the local and strategic road networks, respectively, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. This includes consideration of routes used in and around Norton Disney. In particular, and where practicable, HGV routing is expected to follow the most direct routes to and from the construction access points from the A46 for the Principal Site and to/ from the A15 for the Cable Corridor. This approach avoids HGV movements through Norton Disney and other surrounding villages. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** will restrict HGVs to routes which avoid smaller surrounding villages when travelling to/ from the construction compounds as illustrated by HGV routing plan shown in Figure 13-4 **[APP-110]**,The CTMP establishes controls to ensure that any construction traffic routed close to Norton Disney is appropriately managed, with measures in place to protect pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian safety and to maintain the quiet character of the village as far as practicable. Specifically, regarding Clay Lane, it should be noted that the Proposed Development proposes to use this as an operational access only, where development traffic levels will be nominal. No construction traffic will use Clay Lane. Clay Lane/ Station Road/ Lincoln Lane is an existing junction and will only be used in the operational phase, by small numbers of routine maintenance vehicles predominantly. Production of a detailed CTMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. A Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** has also been prepared and submitted with the DCO application – this document outlines how the Applicant will manage PRoW within the Order Limits to ensure they have been suitably considered and will continue to operate effectively throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. This management plan reviews both user safety and accessibility, during the complete life cycle of the Proposed Development, considering the potential interaction and impact on the PRoW associated with the construction works, as well as the day-to-day operation of the Proposed Development. Production of a detailed PRoW Management Plan, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 18 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Noise and disturbance</u> As explained in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, construction activity is expected to last between 24 and 30 months. Noise from construction activity, including piling, is assessed in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**. With the embedded and additional mitigation measures, identified in Section 11.6 and 11.8 respectively and secured through the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, significant adverse effects on health and quality of life from construction noise are not expected. Results presented for receptor R12 in Table 11-14 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** show that construction noise levels in Norton Disney will be below the level at which adverse effects on the quality of life would occur. Furthermore, construction noise levels have been predicted under the worst-case assumption that all construction activity would be occurring simultaneously when, in practice, given the size of the Order Limits, activities in any given location will only occur for a fraction of the full construction schedule. Table 11-19 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** presents the results of the operational noise calculations under a series of reasonably worst-case assumptions, such as the wind blowing from the source to the receiver. While it is true that substation transformers can produce a low-frequency hum, this would not be perceptible in Norton Disney given its distance from the substation site and no receptors will be significantly adversely affected by operational noise. With reference to R12 in Table 11-19 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**, operational noise levels from the Proposed Development in Norton Disney are expected to be well below the existing background sound level (i.e. the 'relative quiet' of a location) in the area. In addition, the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			NV-01) makes a commitment that the final operational noise levels from the Proposed Development will be no higher than those predicted in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**; modelling will be undertaken at the detailed design phase (as secured by measure NV-01 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**) to confirm the noise levels at sensitive receptors will not exceed these thresholds. Production of a detailed OEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Furthermore, Requirement 16 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** ensures that the operational noise levels set out in Table 11-21 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** are to be complied with. Dust and Air Quality As outlined in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development **[APP-028]**, construction activity is expected to last between 24 and 30 months. Potential impacts from dust and air quality during construction are assessed in Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]**, Section 14.2: Air Quality. With the embedded mitigation measures identified within Section 14.2: Air Quality (Paragraph 14.2.50 onwards) of Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** and additional measures (such as the development and implementation of a Dust Management Plan) which are secured through the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. AQ-C1), Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. AQ-O1) and Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, (ref. AQ-D1), significant adverse effects on health, amenity, or local air quality from construction dust are not expected. Production of a detailed CEMP, OEMP and DEMP, which are to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plans, will be secured under Requirements 12, 13 and 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. The assessment considers reasonably worst-case assumptions, including dry weather conditions and the presence of earthworks and heavy construction traffic. Dust-generating activities will be temporary and localised, and mitigation measures such as water suppression, wheel washing, and material handling controls will be implemented in accordance with best practice and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance. The ES concludes that, with these controls in place, dust deposition on sensitive receptors such as homes, gardens, and crops will be minimised and will not result in significant adverse effects. The commitments to air quality mitigation measures included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. AQ-C1), which is to be developed into a detailed CEMP substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, as secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, will ensure that these commitments are reflected in the detailed CEMP and communicated to all contractors. Lighting and security systems With regards to light pollution, as secured within the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. LV-O3), the proposed lighting for the Proposed Development has been designed to avoid light pollution and adverse effects, including the following: • No areas of the Proposed Development will be continuously lit. • Operational lighting will be triggered by Passive Infra-red Detector (PID) systems, which will be installed around the perimeter of the Proposed Development. • Lighting will be directional with care to minimise potential for light spillage beyond the Order Limits particularly towards neighbouring properties, habitats, highways or waterways. • Lights installed will be of the minimum brightness and/or power rating capable of performing the desired function. • Light fittings will be used to reduce the amount of light emitted above the horizontal (reduce upward lighting). • The lighting of the primary substation will be motion sensor triggered, that would operate from dusk. • Low level lighting on specific operational units will be triggered by motion sensors, from dusk.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			• The inward facing CCTV cameras will typically use night-vision technology and will not require additional lighting. Production of a detailed OEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Mental and physical wellbeing</u> Regarding mental health and physical wellbeing, the Applicant recognises that elements of the Proposed Development have the potential to affect mental health. To address such concerns and support the long-term wellbeing of the community, including mental health, the Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to minimise impacts on health and wellbeing through undertaking not only a comprehensive and robust Environmental Impact Assessment process, but also through extensive consultation and continued open communication at all stages of the Proposed Development. Ongoing engagement with statutory bodies, stakeholders and the community has helped to reduce uncertainty associated with the Proposed Development, which in turn can provide reassurance to local communities that a robust process has been undertaken to identify and implement beneficial design opportunities. In terms of disruption during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases, measures set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**, Framework DEMP **[APP-190]** and Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** will reduce or avoid mental health related impacts. These include measures such as new planting to screen views and by reducing the amount of solar PV in Field 46 to avoid a significant visual effect from any residential dwellings during the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. Once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, which can have a quality of life benefit for users through improving access to recreation. The framework plans noted above are to be developed into detailed management plans, substantially in accordance with the respective Frameworks, secured under Requirements 12, 13, 20 and 8, respectively, of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Furthermore, a Community Liaison Group is secured through Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which requires the establishment of a community liaison group prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development. Such a group has already been established by the Applicant and will continue during construction and operation. This group provides an opportunity for the local community to engage with the Applicant, learn about the detailed design post consent, express concerns, and be kept up to date. It is expected on this basis that the group will play an important role in helping to reduce/minimise stress. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a Community Benefit Fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This Community Benefit Fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community.
	2	Loss of Productive Agricultural Land The proposal removes large areas of productive farmland from cultivation for at least 60 years. This loss undermines local food production, damages the rural economy, and conflicts with both national and local policies to protect Best and Most Versatile agricultural land (Grades 1–3a).	With regards to the loss of agricultural land, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[APP-185]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		It also impacts daily life for farming communities whose operations rely on shared infrastructure such as lanes and watercourses, which may be disrupted by cable works or restricted access.	The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Good design will be secured by delivering the Proposed Development in a way that meets the design principles. This includes Design Principle 2, as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, which provides that the Proposed Development will be sensitive to existing agricultural land quality, reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha of Grade 3a land which is to be used for ecological enhancements. This is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although the withdrawal of this land from agricultural production is established as a minor adverse effect. With regards to the concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon agricultural production, as considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the 1,018.7 ha (or 2,517.3 acres) of agricultural land required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Moreover, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Proposed Development recognises the need to allow current farming practices to continue. The Order Limits include areas of new grassland for bird mitigation and a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (or 447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. Furthermore, to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on BMV land, Chapter 12: Socio-Economic and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.6.4) sets out embedded mitigation measures including the use of panels at a height which could support sheep grazing (which would allow for this land to remain in productive agricultural use), and capitalising on the opportunity to improve soil structure during the period of suspended agricultural activities throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The Framework SMP **[APP-192]** a detailed version of which is secured via Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, contains industry standard good practice mitigation measures to reduce impacts on soil which will ensure that the ALC grade will be unaltered through operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. With regards to potential impacts upon the rural economy, Section 12.7 of Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, concludes that during construction of the Proposed Development there would be minor beneficial effects on employment and on gross-value added, which taken together can be considered to be a positive economic impact for residents within a 60 minute-drive time of the Proposed Development during this stage. With regards to economic and other benefits, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** has considered the existing jobs supported by the agricultural land. As noted in paragraph 12.7.52 of this chapter, it has been confirmed by all landowners that no job losses are expected as a result of the removal of agricultural land. It is expected that when the rent revenues from the land start, there will be additional jobs

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			created on their farms offsite as landowners diversify their land further with the underlying financial stability of the rental income. With regards to the duration of the operation of the Proposed Development, it should be noted that the non-permanent and reversible nature of a solar NSIP with 60 year consent has also been acknowledged in the Secretary of State's decisions on Tillbridge Solar Farm, Mallard Pass Solar Project, West Burton and Gate Burton Energy Parks which have all been granted development consent. NPS EN-3 also supports this position at paragraph 2.10.66 which states that: "*time limited consent, where granted, is described as temporary because there is a finite period for which it exists, after which the project would cease to have consent and therefore must seek to extend the period of consent or be decommissioned and removed*." The lifespan of 60 years has been identified as being a suitable period during which the Proposed Development can provide energy to the national electricity grid. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational period the land would be available for its current use. Any material change of use would require planning permission. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential disruption to farming communities using the local road network and watercourses. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**, Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** and Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** submitted with the DCO Application include a suite of mitigation measures to manage construction, operation, and decommissioning activities upon local roads and watercourses, whereby the optimal access strategy has been designed to minimise impacts on transport and access, thereby mitigating any potential effects on farming operations and the use of shared infrastructure. The respective detailed versions of these management plans, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework Plans, as secured by the Draft DCO, will set out to minimise impacts by maintaining safe access along existing lanes where possible, planning construction crossings carefully, protecting watercourses through pollution prevention measures, and working closely with landowners to coordinate works and maintain access to their land throughout all phases of the project. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (e.g. ref. WAT-C7, (d)) sets out that watercourses will be reinstated as found and water quality monitoring that will be undertaken prior to, during, and following on from the construction activity. A Water Management Plan (WMP) (which will be produced post consent as part of the detailed CEMP(s)) will include details of pre, during and post-construction water quality monitoring, therefore demonstrating due consideration has been given to safeguarding watercourses during the construction phase.
	3	Battery-Storage Safety The inclusion of large lithium-ion battery storage systems raises serious health, safety, and environmental risks. Such facilities have been associated elsewhere with fires, explosions, and toxic gas emissions. The proposal site lies close to homes, roads, and farmland — placing residents, emergency services, and the local environment at risk in the event of malfunction. The applicant's documents provide little reassurance on fire-suppression design, containment measures, or emergency procedures. This lack of detailed safety information causes genuine anxiety for local residents and is a legitimate planning concern affecting daily peace of mind and perceived personal safety.	As set out within the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, (ref. paragraph 2.3.5) the Applicant has committed to ensure a minimum buffer of 150m from the distributed BESS units to residential receptors, and 200m from the centralised BESS units to residential receptors, which will avoid significant effects on nearby receptors in the unlikely event of a fire. Appendix 14-G: Unplanned Emissions Assessment **[APP-176]** assesses the impact of airborne chemicals and gases produced in the event of a BESS fire and shows that the dilution of gases and the distance from the BESS is sufficient to avoid any exceedances of airborne gas safety levels. Furthermore, a variety of assessments have been carried out to address any potential areas of risk from the BESS as detailed in the Environmental Statement **[APP-025 - APP-179]**. The Proposed Development includes embedded design mitigation (see paragraph above and below) and protection measures to reduce fire/explosion risk are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. These measures include, for example, an automatic cooling system which will be integrated into the BESS to stop or reduce the risk of a cell from overheating and failing and triggering a chain reaction in neighbouring cells. Under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** a detailed BSMP must be submitted to LCC for approval which must prescribe measures to facilitate safety during construction, operation and decommissioning of the BESS. This detailed BSMP must be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP and LCC must consult with LFRS and the Environment Agency before approving the BSMP.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			The BESS is designed so that in the event one cell overheats/catches fire, there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent which it is possible to control this)). This layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. The LFRS would be expected to let a BESS fire burn out, but the focus of the Framework BSMP is to prevent a fire occurring. There have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development.
	4	Preferable Siting on Buildings and Brownfield Land There is clear national policy support for installing solar panels on rooftops, industrial estates, car parks, and brownfield sites — locations that already host built infrastructure and grid connections. The applicant has not demonstrated that these preferable alternatives were properly considered. Using productive farmland for solar generation while large urban roof spaces remain underused is inefficient and environmentally short-sighted.	Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered for siting the Proposed Development. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. Three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of the sites were large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres). The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Therefore, no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, 2 of the 3 sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site, Hawdin's Wood included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, which closed in 1993, however given the site has been developed for a range of uses, including a logistics compound and the extraction of sand and gravel, as set out in paragraph 4.4.5 and 4.4.6 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such as decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land, for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on its own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching need established in NPS EN-1 and the technology-specific policy support for renewable energy infrastructure set out in NPS EN-3. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. As set out above, these land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.
	5	Cumulative Impact	The Applicant acknowledges that there is the potential for cumulative effects as a result of the combined impact of the Proposed Development together with other energy schemes proposed in the area and recognises local

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		The Lincolnshire area faces a growing number of large-scale energy projects, including Fosse Green, Springwell, and Beacon Fen. Collectively, these schemes would blanket much of the countryside between Lincoln, Newark, and Sleaford with solar arrays, battery compounds, and grid infrastructure. This cumulative industrialisation would make rural living increasingly difficult — through visual dominance, construction disruption, and the psychological effect of being surrounded by energy infrastructure. Villages such as Norton Disney would experience disproportionate harm.	concerns regarding the concentration of energy developments in Lincolnshire. A detailed cumulative effects assessment has been provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. The cumulative effects assessment followed a staged approach and considered relevant developments and land allocations within a 10km radius from the Proposed Development, including NSIPs. A wider county level study area was used for the cumulative effects assessment in relation to BMV Agricultural Land which considers other Solar NSIPs within the County of Lincolnshire. The cumulative effects assessment (Section 15.5 of Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions **[APP-040]**) has adequately assessed impacts of the Proposed Development together with the identified cumulative schemes during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases (noting effects during decommissioning were assumed to be no worse than effects during construction). The temporal overlap of cumulative schemes with the Proposed Development, including the overlap of construction phases was an important consideration during the assessment of cumulative effects. Therefore, the potential for cumulative effects resulting from construction disruption has been appropriately assessed in the ES. As summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. paragraph 15.5.24), significant adverse cumulative effects are only identified on landscape and visual amenity receptors, however the significance of effect attributed to the Proposed Development alone is not increased when considering these other developments alongside the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The following significant cumulative effects were established during construction, where the magnitude of effect is higher than that of the Proposed Development in isolation. During construction: • Major Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects upon the North Kesteven District landscape sub-area Witham and Brant Vales due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction. Additionally, changes are anticipated to the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way (PRoW Cole/2/1 and BooG/2/2) as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID95 Application Reference: PL/0087/23, North Hykeham Relief Road, resulting in a Major adverse effect which is significant. • Moderate Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects on the North Kesteven landscape sub-area Limestone Heath due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID63 Application Reference: EN010149, Springwell Energy Farm and ID103 Application Reference: EN0110016, Leoda Solar Farm, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect which is significant. During operation (year 15) it is considered there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that, given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. The Proposed Development has been subject to an iterative design process to minimise impacts on local communities. Embedded mitigation measures include new planting, enhanced management of existing vegetation, and the introduction of offsets to reduce visibility of infrastructure from nearby settlements such as Norton Disney. These measures are designed to reduce the visual dominance of the development and limit the contribution of the Proposed Development to cumulative landscape and visual effects.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
	6	Biodiversity and Habitat Loss The construction footprint, access tracks, and fencing will fragment habitats and restrict wildlife movement. Existing hedgerows and field margins — key corridors for birds and pollinators — could be damaged or reduced. While the applicant claims biodiversity net gain, this must be independently verified and legally secured, not merely asserted.	Section 8.9 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** identifies these potential construction impacts. As a first principal, the Proposed Development has sought to avoid important ecological features (IEFs) (such as designated sites, priority habitats and protected species) through shaping the design of the Proposed Development. Where this has not been practicable, then embedded mitigation measures have been added to form an integral, committed and deliverable part of the Proposed Development design that does not compromise standard construction practices, such as habitat creation and enhancement (for example, woodland planting, new hedgerows, natural regeneration areas and pond restoration). These mitigation measures are included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** and Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, detailed versions of which will be secured by Requirements 12, 13 and 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With these proposed mitigation measures in place, no significant effects are anticipated on important ecological features and the Proposed Development has the potential to generate beneficial effects for a range of the IEFs. The proposed planting design is shown in Figure 7.15-1: Landscape Mitigation Plan within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. Based on the indicative layout of the Principal Site, new planting would include, in addition to hedgerow enhancement, gapping up and infill planting, and grassland under the panels and along perimeter buffers. As stated in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** there is currently no target BNG based on national or local policy for NSIPs, instead the requirement is for the achievement of no-net-loss (≥0% BNG). Although not mandated, the Applicant has committed to deliver a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4) for the Proposed Development. This is secured by Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
	7	Decommissioning, Legacy, and Community Benefits The proposed 60-year operational life effectively excludes the land from agricultural use for several generations. Any approval should require a legally binding decommissioning and land-restoration plan, backed by financial guarantees. While the applicant offers some community benefits (planting, permissive paths, or liaison groups), these are minimal compared to the long-term adverse effects on local landscape, amenity, and wellbeing. Conclusion I acknowledge the urgent need for renewable energy, but the Fosse Green Energy proposal in its current form would cause unacceptable harm to the landscape, local community, safety, and quality of life in and around Norton Disney and surrounding villages. It would: Transform peaceful rural surroundings into an industrial site; Disrupt daily life through traffic, noise, dust, and light pollution; Remove valuable farmland for decades; Introduce significant safety risks from large battery systems; Fail to explore brownfield and rooftop alternatives; and Contribute to the cumulative over-industrialisation of Lincolnshire's countryside. I therefore respectfully request that the Examining Authority refuse the application or require major redesign to reduce scale, relocate battery storage away from residential areas, and prioritise less sensitive land. Thank you for considering my representation.	As set out above, it should be noted that the Proposed Development does not exclude the land within the Order Limits from agricultural use, where the need to allow current farming practices to continue has been considered throughout the design evolution process. As a result of the iterative design process, the DOC Site include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which provides both mitigation for ground nesting birds and allows current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. Furthermore, to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on agricultural land, Chapter 12: Socio-Economic and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** sets out embedded mitigation measures including the potential use of panels at a height which could support sheep grazing within the Principal Site. With regards to decommissioning and land restoration, at the end of the operational period the infrastructure will be removed and the land returned to the landowner for future use, in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, secured through the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which is legally binding, and will be approved by the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to the end of the operational period. The DCO process provides a legally enforceable mechanism requiring the Applicant to deliver decommissioning. The Applicant considers that the measures within the Draft DCO provide an appropriate and proportionate level of assurance that decommissioning and restoration will occur at the end of the project's life. This is in line with other consented solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire, including Tillbridge Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project. Alongside the benefits noted, it should be noted that, should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community benefit fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community benefit fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. Suggestions to date have included funding towards improvements to existing community facilities, such as village halls and sports facilities, provision of electrical vehicle charging points, subsidised solar PV panels for community use and lower cost energy, grants for broadband and wider improvements, educational visits and wider education/apprenticeship opportunities. The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding potential disruption from traffic, noise, dust, and lighting during construction and operation. These matters have been comprehensively assessed within the ES (Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]**, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]** and Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**, and appropriate mitigation has been put in place to minimise effects where possible, as set out in the responses above. As referred to above, the Applicant's Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** was drafted to comprehensively address all key BESS safety requirements through failure prevention, monitoring / control systems, and hazard mitigation systems / protocols. The provision of a detailed BSMP, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP, is secured via Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. As referred to in further detail above, Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. These land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.
RR-060	1	Part of The Fosse Green project is located on land my family and I own between the A46 and Aubourn fen. In line with National and International government policies, we aim to ensure that our farming system becomes Carbon Neutral within the next 5 years. The current arable production model no longer works on our farm. Commodity prices, climate change, flooding and cost inflation have driven us along with everyone in "Farming" to reconsider their purpose. We have entered the farm into a tier 3 Landscape Recovery scheme The Witham Valley Nature Recovery Network. This will support our move towards this aim and offer much improved habitats for Nature. In relation to the Solar areas, we have developed a network of shelter belts, woodlands and scrub areas, ponds plantings and grassland which will provide visual screening for virtually all the solar arrays. These screening belts will intersect with a range of new public access routes around the farm for visitors with or without their dogs. The Solar scheme has been greatly improved since its initial announcement and now includes many carefully considered nature beneficial features which, along with our own separate plantings etc. will, we are sure, make this into an exemplary scheme. Biodiversity is a critical driver in the evolution of our new Agricultural system and ensuring that the solar panels contribute beneficially to that is another key target. Management of the solar areas with appropriate pollinator mixes and control with sheep along with minimising the hard engineering used in erecting the	The Applicant welcomes the supportive representation from the landowner and acknowledges their longstanding stewardship of the land around Aubourn. The comments highlight the wider challenges facing the agricultural sector, the landowner's proactive transition towards carbon neutral and regenerative land management and the evolution of the Proposed Development design to benefit local landowners. The Applicant notes the significant habitat creation and landscape enhancements already undertaken by the landowner, including shelter belts, woodland and scrub planting, ponds, and species-rich grassland. These measures complement the landscape and ecological mitigation embedded within the Proposed Development and will assist in delivering meaningful biodiversity benefits and effective visual screening. The provision of new public access routes is also welcomed as a wider community benefit and will complement the 9.5km of permissive paths to be implemented as part of the Proposed Development (to be secured by Requirement 8 and Requirement 17 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). The Applicant is grateful for the recognition that the Proposed Development has been refined through consultation to maximise environmental benefits, minimise ecological, visual and amenity impacts, and support soil health through appropriate grassland, pollinator management, and sheep grazing and agrees that resting the soil resource over a prolonged period will be beneficial to future generations. Overall, the Applicant appreciates the landowner's view that the Proposed Development can contribute positively to biodiversity, soil recovery, and the rural environment and welcomes the support for the Proposed Development.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		structures and careful management of the rainfall channels will allow the whole project to be beneficial to soil health over its lifetime. Solar energy may not be a silver bullet to resolve all the power needs of the country, but it will make it's contribution, it can be beneficial for biodiversity and it will make a positive contribution to the rural environment through associated benefits. My family have farmed around Aubourn for at least 500 years. Within that context a fallow period of 20/30 years, to rest the soils after a period of intensive farming, may well be the best thing that could happen for the soils and for Nature.	
RR-080	1	I would object to this project on the grounds of traffic, loss of agricultural land, noise, pollution. This is in a very rural area and not the appropriate place for such a project. There are acres of warehouse roofs and houses which could accommodate the solar panels, not prime agricultural land.	<u>Traffic and Transport</u> An assessment of the potential effects relating to additional construction traffic is set out within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legislation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A **[APP-163]**. This concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. LCC and National Highways in their capacity of being responsible for the local and strategic road networks respectively, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. Production of a detailed CTMP, to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, is secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Loss of Agricultural Land</u> With regards to the loss of agricultural land, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.7.44), the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a land which is to be used for ecological enhancements. This is likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the withdrawal of land from agricultural production is a minor adverse effect. It should be noted that the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.64 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. <u>Noise</u> Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** assesses the construction, operational and decommissioning noise impacts of the Proposed Development. It describes the embedded mitigation measures included in the Proposed Development and, with the commitments to minimise noise made within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** and Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, does not identify any significant adverse noise effects as a result of the Proposed Development. The framework plans noted above are

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			to be developed into detailed plans, substantially in accordance with the framework plans, secured under Requirements 12, 13 and 20, respectively, of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Air Quality Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES (Section 14.2: Air Quality) **[APP-039]** assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on local air quality during both construction and operation. The assessment considers dust generation, vehicle emissions, and other relevant factors, and sets out proposed mitigation measures, including best practice dust control and adherence to the measures set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. With these measures in place, the assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects on air quality are anticipated. The Framework CEMP is to be developed into a detailed CEMP, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, secured under Requirements 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Site Selection and Use of Rooftop Solar As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such as decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on its own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1.
RR-088	1	Would like to object to the project submitted by Fosse Green Energy Limited - on the grounds that the area proposed is currently being used for agriculture purposes growing food crops for both human and animal consumption - these crops include wheat, barley, sugar beet, potatoes, onions and other root crops suitable for animal feeds. The area chosen although rural is now on the cusp of the expanding village of Witham St Hughs. I don't feel that the project has considered those who live in this area having limited consultation with those who will be living in the middle of the project like myself. Meetings that have taken place have always been at short notice and not convenient to those who work a full time job - meetings have been held midweek during the middle of the day. Any other information that has been received has never been clear or concise leaving many questions unanswered. The confusion of compulsory purchase of land has also been used as a scaremongering technique - causing confusion for some residents that own their properties. There are other areas within the county that could accommodate such a project - it seems that brown field sites have been overlooked, and other options not considered. The fear of not being able to grow produce in our own country due to the amount of land being earmarked for of solar projects is a worrying concern for the future.	Use of Agricultural Land The Applicant acknowledges the representation regarding the current agricultural use of land within the Order Limits. However, it is important to place the scale and nature of land use into context. The total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% (1,018.7ha or 2517.3 acres) of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, approximately 50% of the land within the proposed principal site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. While the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production, at the choice of the landowner. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. The loss of agricultural land, has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. In addition, it should be noted that the Proposed Development recognises the need to allow current farming practices to continue. The Order Limits include areas of new grassland for bird mitigation and a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			It is important to note that any loss of agricultural production resulting from the Proposed Development would be temporary. The Applicant is seeking consent for a 60-year operational period. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational life, the land will be available for agricultural use or any other use the landowner chooses. Overall, the Proposed Development has been designed to balance the need for low-carbon energy generation with the temporary nature of impacts on agricultural land. <u>Consultation</u> The consultation process was designed to engage with those local communities who may be most affected by the Proposed Development. The Applicant defined a Core Consultation Zone of 3 km from the site which received a direct mailing during each consultation process (both the non-statutory and statutory consultations) and a Wider Consultation Zone of 5 km from the site. This was to reach interested individuals or parties who were not only within the Core Consultation Zone. The non-statutory and statutory consultation events were open to anyone who wished to attend. Attendees were able to ask questions about the Proposed Development and the ways for attendees to provide feedback were presented during the events. The events for the non-statutory and statutory consultations were scheduled at a range of times and took place on both weekdays and weekends, at various venues to enable people with different time commitments to attend the events. An evening online webinar was also held during each consultation to allow people to attend who could not travel to the in-person events. The Applicant used a range of methods to share information about the proposals and to reach different audiences. This included digital methods - a project website, holding webinars and hosting online feedback forms, as well as holding in-person events and sending hard-copy letters to residents and other stakeholders. The Applicant aimed to present information clearly and concisely. Consultation booklets were published at the non-statutory and statutory consultation which presented technical information in an accessible format. Information was also available online and communication channels, including an email and freephone line, were available for people to use at any stage of development to ask questions about the Proposed Development. <u>Compulsory Purchase</u> The site selection process, as detailed in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, sought to reduce the need for the use of compulsory acquisition powers. The availability of willing landowners was an important consideration and suitable landowners were approached by the Applicant to discuss inclusion of their landholdings into the Proposed Development. The Applicant now has 88% of the Principal Site under Option and 75% of the landowners within the Cable Corridor under Heads of Terms, being progressed to Option. The Applicant is seeking to secure the rest of the land for the Principal Site and Cable Corridor by way of voluntary agreement. The Applicant did not intend to cause undue concern among affected landowners by including compulsory acquisition powers within the DCO for the Proposed Development. In applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and similar developments, it is well-established practice for applicants to seek compulsory acquisition powers in conjunction with pursuing voluntary agreements with landowners. This is to ensure that the Proposed Development can proceed if granted development consent.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			It is necessary for the Applicant to be granted the compulsory acquisition powers included in the Order so as to protect against a scenario whereby a voluntary agreement is not adhered to or otherwise is set aside, for example: (i) freehold owners of the land within the Order Limits (where agreement has been reached) do not grant a lease of the land in accordance with the terms of the completed option agreements; or (ii) the contracting party dies, is subject to divorce proceedings, or is declared insolvent. In those circumstances, it would be in the public interest for the Proposed Development to proceed and the interests in question effectively converted into a claim for compensation and is one of the reasons that compulsory acquisition powers are being sought alongside the Applicant seeking voluntary agreements with landowners. The Applicant also needs powers to extinguish and/or suspend rights and override easements and other rights in the Order Limits to the extent that they would conflict with the Proposed Development. In addition, it is necessary to include compulsory acquisition powers to enable the Applicant to deal with land within the Order Limits where, despite undertaking diligent enquiries, it has not been possible to identify ownership. Further details of the Applicant's approach to compulsory acquisition, including the justification for this is included in the Statement of Reasons **[APP-020]**. In relation to this specific person with an interest in land, the Applicant will shortly be making contact in order to seek to agree a voluntary agreement for the acquisition of rights in their land. <u>Site Selection</u> Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered for siting the Proposed Development. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. Three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of the sites were large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres). The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Therefore, no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, 2 of the 3 sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site Hawdin's Wood included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, however given the site has been developed for a range of uses, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. As set out above, these land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. <u>Food Production</u> With regards to the concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon agricultural production, this is considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. The 1,018.7ha (2,517.26 acres) of agricultural land required temporarily for construction and operation constitutes 0.09% of the total farmland in the East midlands and is unlikely to result in an impact of food production or an increase of food imports. Furthermore, approximately 50% of the land within the Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. While the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation.
RR-104	1	I am part of the farm who rents 311.35Ac of Housham. It is currently in a Sustainable Farming Incentive agreement which protects over 60,000m2 of Improved Grassland Per Year. It is also a valuable carbon sink of around 68tCarbon Per Year. The effects of this on the wider environment and local sustainable businesses committed to recycling would be disastrous. Although the land is only grade 3 it supports incredibly high wheat yields due to its high clay content and also supports fodder beet and sugar beet. I need to discuss this with someone at length,	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the use of the land at Housham, particularly in relation to its current participation in the Sustainable Farming Incentive and its role as a carbon sink. Following receipt of Relevant Representation **[RR-104]**, the Applicant has directly contacted the persons with land interest in this area of Housham and has discussed the concerns raised. The Applicant recognises the importance of these environmental and agricultural benefits and can confirm that this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on agricultural land and agricultural operations. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains how the layout has been refined to respond to agricultural sensitivities, including Design Principle 2 (Section 3.9), which seeks to minimise impacts on agricultural land and, in particular, on BMV land. The Proposed Development recognises the need to allow current farming practices to continue and the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. The land temporarily affected by the Proposed Development will be managed in accordance with soil health and land management best practice, including appropriate handling, storage and reinstatement of soils (as set out within the Framework SMP **[APP-192]**) and habitat creation and planting proposals as part of the Proposed Development are intended to protect soil structure and support long-term land productivity and environmental value. The Applicant notes that the area of land referred to in the representation supports high wheat yield, fodder beet and sugar beet. However, any loss of agricultural production due to the Proposed Development would be temporary. The Applicant is seeking consent for a 60-year operational period – under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational period the infrastructure will be removed and the land returned to the landowner for future use, in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, secured through the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, and the land would be available for its current use. The Applicant remains committed to engaging with landowners and stakeholders and has since been in contact to discuss the Proposed Development as requested. <u>Climate Change</u> An assessment of the carbon effects of the project is presented in Chapter 6: Climate Change **[APP-031]**. In paragraph 6.4.29 it sets out the position that there is likely to be limited change in emissions associated with land

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			use and sequestration. The figure of 68 tonnes of carbon per year would be immaterial compared to the benefits and carbon savings of the project set out in paragraph 6.4.73 of over 3 million tonnes of carbon over the life span of the Proposed Development. <u>Waste</u> As outlined in Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]** Section 14.5 Materials and Waste of the ES, paragraph 14.5.91 *"It is assumed that specialist regional or national facilities would be in place at the time of component replacement and decommissioning **[of the Proposed Development]**, and these would be developed in response to demand generated by the UK-wide solar PV panel industry and waste components would be reused, recycled, or recovered and not disposed of to landfill."* Recycling of waste from the Proposed Development is unlikely to have an impact on the ability of local sustainable businesses to recycle their waste.
RR-127	1	Issues over using quality farming land above roofs. Impact on the environment and local road infrastructure.	<u>Use of Agricultural Land</u> As set out in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]** and supported by the Government's overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) and NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3), while smaller-scale solar on rooftops or brownfield land contributes to decarbonisation, it is unlikely to deliver the scale of generation needed at the required pace and cost. Large-scale solar is an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Reasonable alternatives were considered during the site selection process (see the Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**), including brownfield and non-agricultural land. No suitable sites of the required scale were identified within a viable distance of the proposed grid connection near Navenby. The Proposed Development has been designed to minimise impacts on BMV land, with only 1.5 ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a land permanently lost to ecological enhancement which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the withdrawal of land from agricultural production has been established as a minor adverse effect. Any loss of agricultural production due to the Proposed Development would be temporary. The Applicant is seeking consent for a 60-year operational period – under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational period the infrastructure will be removed and the land returned to the landowner for future use, in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, secured through the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, and the land would be available for its current use. <u>Local Road Infrastructure</u> The potential effects of construction traffic on the environment and local road infrastructure have been appropriately assessed in Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, following the relevant legislation and planning policy in Appendix 13-A **[APP-163]**. The assessment concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects upon traffic and transport receptors with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. The assessment has used the shortest expected construction programme (24 months), which provides a worst-case scenario in terms of construction vehicle trips (a more condensed construction programme would result in a higher intensity of vehicle trips, the worst-case scenario would be the maximum trips per day) as this is based on

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			a rapid, and so shorter, construction period that would generate the highest number of peak hour and daily road trips on the local network. In addition, LCC and National Highways in their capacity of being responsible for the local and strategic road networks, respectively, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. Measures to manage construction traffic, including site access, vehicle routing and staff travel are detailed in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**. The CTMP is designed to minimise potential disruption to the local highway network and potential environmental effects associated with construction traffic. Production of a detailed CTMP, to be developed into a detailed substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, is secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-163	1	Far too close to my grade 2 listed property for BESS.	<u>Heritage and Visual Impact</u> With regard to impacts to the heritage significance of the Grade II Listed Property, the ES Appendix 7-D: Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]** provides an appropriate assessment of any harm to the asset from the Proposed Development, including from the location of the BESS. The potential impacts on the Listed Building were discussed with Historic England during an in-person meeting on site on 15 September 2025. In response to Historic England's concerns regarding the proximity of solar PV to the Grade II Listed Property (as well as further heritage assets at Aubourn), amendments have been made to the design of the Proposed Development to remove panels from Field 46. Historic England did not raise any further requirements for any mitigation with regard to the location of the BESS. The outcomes of these consultations are summarised within the SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England (which is currently under preparation and will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]** deadline), and the changes reflected within updated plans as relevant (e.g. the Works Plans **[AS-105]**) and updated photomontages **[AS-119]**. As reported in the updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 10 of the ES **[AS-117]**), the removal of solar PV in Field 46 adjoining the Grade II Listed Property, and the amendment of proposed landscaping (as set out in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) results in the assessment of visual effects at this property reducing from Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects in Years 1 and 15 (Winter) of operation, and Minor Adverse (Not Significant) in Summer Year 15, to Minor Adverse (Not Significant) at Year 1 Winter, and Negligible Adverse at Year 15 Winter and Summer. <u>Battery Safety</u> With regards to battery safety, the centralised BESS is likely to be located approximately 300m (note a minimum commitment of 200m as set out in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5), which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline, from residential receptors which will avoid significant effects on nearby receptors in the unlikely event of a fire. Appendix 14-G: Unplanned Emissions Assessment **[APP-176]** assesses the impact of airborne chemicals and gases produced in the event of a BESS fire and shows that the dilution of gases and the distance from the BESS is sufficient to avoid any exceedances of airborne gas safety levels. There have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, a variety of assessments have been carried out to address potential areas of risk from the BESS as detailed in the Environmental Statement **[APP-025 - APP-179]**, and the Proposed Development includes

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			embedded design mitigation and protection measures to reduce fire/explosion risk, which are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. The BESS is designed so that there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent which it is possible to control this)). This layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. the focus of the Framework BSMP is to prevent a fire occurring. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, secured under Requirement 7 (Battery safety management) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the LFRS are a named consultee on this Requirement, and as such the LFRS will have the opportunity to review the detailed BSMP prior to any approval.
RR-184	1	[redacted] & neighbouring [redacted] are without doubt set to be amongst the most severely impacted by the solar farm as they are situated in the middle of acres of it, surrounded on all sides. The loss of property value is difficult to estimate but certainly the USP of the remote & rural location is lost, even with screening; the very nature of a screen is to obscure views of what is currently a quintessentially Lincolnshire landscape. Some studies suggest a 20% reduction owing to diminished buyer appeal. Without question, I would not have bought this property had it been a solar farmhouse. The financial impact will be compounded by the inevitable intrusion on daily life: expansive solar arrays will destroy views from upstairs windows & on either side of the drive entrance, mechanical noise from inverters and substation transformers will undermine the tranquillity of the home as will light pollution. Beyond the immediate impact on [redacted] &. neighbouring properties, the Proposed Development would irrevocably alter the rural character that defines this corner of North Kesteven. Deer are currently frequent visitors but these will no longer wander freely and generally the strong sense of connection between a farmhouse home and countryside is ruptured. Although the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations require an assessment of environmental impacts, the submitted Environmental Statement underplays the harm to local amenity and cultural heritage, and the scheme fails to satisfy National Policy Statement EN-1's obligation to minimise adverse landscape effects or to conform with locally adopted rural and heritage conservation objectives. The proposals for mitigation and screening around [redacted] are inadequate, even if screening were really a mitigation, which it is not for reasons already outlined. Gaps in the planned hedgerow belts and bund locations leave key viewpoints exposed, and neither the noise model nor the glare assessment reflects worst-case meteorological conditions. There is no firm commitment to maintain planting or to monitor buffer effectiveness over time. Requested Outcomes: Require the adoption of enforceable buffer zones, multi-layered planting schemes and high-performance noise barriers to secure visual screening and acoustic protection.	<u>Impact to Property Value</u> In terms of property value, there are currently no known studies relating to solar, however in 2014, the Centre for Economics and Business Research and Renewable UK conducted a study of over one million homes in the UK to analyse the effect of wind farms on house prices. It found that onshore wind farms had no impact on the value of residential properties within a 5km radius. The Applicant notes that this study serves to illustrate the point, given solar panels are visually less obtrusive than wind turbines, as there are no current studies in relation to the solar sector and no conclusive evidence of solar development leading to reduced housing values. <u>Noise</u> Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** assesses the operational noise impacts of the Proposed Development. Results presented in Table 11-19 show that no properties are expected to be significantly adversely affected by the noise from the Proposed Developments, including the inverters and substation transformers. Additionally, the noise model applies "*moderate downwind conditions*" at receptor points when calculating noise, which means that results have been calculated under reasonable worst-case meteorological conditions. The result at R10 indicates that operational noise from the Proposed Development at [redacted] is likely to be below the existing background sound level. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** makes a commitment that the final operational noise levels from the Proposed Development will be no higher than those predicted in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**; modelling will be undertaken at the detailed design phase (as secured by measure NV-01 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**) to confirm the noise levels at sensitive receptors will not exceed these thresholds. Production of a detailed OEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Furthermore, Requirement 16 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** ensures that the operational noise levels set out in Table 11-21 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** are to be complied with. <u>Light Pollution</u> With regards to light pollution, as secured within the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. LV-O3), the proposed lighting for the Proposed Development has been designed to avoid light pollution and adverse effects. The mitigation is as follows: • No areas of the Proposed Development will be continuously lit. • Operational lighting will be triggered by Passive Infra-red Detector (PID) systems, which will be installed around the perimeter of the Proposed Development. • Lighting will be directional with care to minimise potential for light spillage beyond the Order Limits particularly towards neighbouring properties, habitats, highways or waterways. • Lights installed will be of the minimum brightness and/or power rating capable of performing the desired function.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		Establish a transparent compensation and community-benefit fund—administered by an independent panel—to offset property-value losses and amenity degradation. Commission an independent feasibility study into alternative site options or a reduced development footprint to safeguard [redacted] family heritage, landscape character and market value. Summary: [redacted] & neighbours at [redacted] oppose the DCO in its current form and call for its refusal unless the project's location, scale and design are comprehensively revised to prevent adverse impacts on [redacted]	• Light fittings will be used to reduce the amount of light emitted above the horizontal (reduce upward lighting). • The lighting of the primary substation will be motion sensor triggered, that would operate from dusk. • Low level lighting on specific operational units will be triggered by motion sensors, from dusk. • The inward facing CCTV cameras will typically use night-vision technology and will not require additional lighting. Production of a detailed OEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Ecology</u> With the implementation of mitigation secured by the management plans submitted with the DCO Application (e.g. the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**), Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-035]** concludes that there would be no effect upon 'other mammals' (ref. Table 8-15). To ensure impacts on mammals such as deer are minimised, all security perimeter fencing will include gaps to allow small/medium sized mammals to pass underneath at strategic locations to maintain ecological connectivity, as secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (e.g. ref. ECO-C1). The final locations of these mammal passes will be determined following pre-commencement surveys. Existing hedgerows and wildlife corridors will also be retained outside of the security perimeter, to allow the continued movement of mammals across the landscape. Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Heritage</u> The Applicant has given due regard to the historic landscape components within the Order Limits, with the heritage significance and potential impacts upon the historic landscape resource, including historic hedgerows within the Order Limits boundary, assessed in detail within the Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment of the ES **[APP-128]**. Historic hedgerows are mapped on Figure 7-E-3 **[APP-128]** and, as illustrated on Figure 3-2A Indicative Fixed South Facing Site Layout Plan of the ES **[AS-022]** and the Hedgerow Plan **[AS-112]**, the layout of the surviving historic hedgerow boundaries will be retained, with breaches only required to facilitate circulation and access, which would not affect the historical integrity of the network of historic hedgerows. The Applicant would like to respond to the comment that the Environmental Statement underplays harm to cultural heritage. The Proposed Development has been designed taking into account heritage constraints. The design was informed by staged assessment work in order to remove or reduce potential impacts upon heritage assets, and reflects a proactive approach to identifying, assessing and mitigating impacts (please refer to Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially Appendix 7-B Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment **[APP-125]**, Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]**, and Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment **[APP-128]**). which detail the comprehensive level of assessment work undertaken). As such, the Applicant is of the opinion that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the significance of the cultural heritage resource and the potential impact of the Proposed Development upon this resource, and measures have been built into the process to ensure appropriate and proportionate mitigation is included. <u>Glint and glare</u> The glint and glare assessment (Appendix 14-D of the ES **[AS-092]**) modelled an initial bald-earth scenario, with no consideration of local vegetation, other obstacles, and cloud cover, which is considered the worst-case scenario. However, the results of the assessment are based upon a review of the actual visibility of receptors, when taking into account topography and local screening (both existing and proposed). This is considered a

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			robust assessment approach, as it combines a worst-case model with a review of actual visibility of receptors which ensures the conclusions are not over or under-estimating the effects. Further detail is set out in Appendix 14-D of the ES **[AS-092]**. Receptor 157 of the glint and glare assessment (Appendix 14-D of the ES **[AS-092]**) represents [redacted] and [redacted] – the results (ref. paragraph 7.1) show that following the implementation of mitigation (as shown in Figure 7.15-1: Landscape Masterplan, presented within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**), the glint and glare effects at this receptor will be 'None'. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Visual Impact, Amenity Landscaping and Planting</u> With regards to the comment stating the submitted Environmental Statement underplays the harm to local amenity, the Proposed Development has been subject to an iterative design process to minimise impacts on local amenity (Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution **[APP-029]**). Embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development such as new planting, enhanced management of existing vegetation, and the introduction of offsets to reduce visibility of infrastructure from nearby settlements. These measures are designed to reduce the visual dominance of the Proposed Development. With regard to the mitigation around [redacted] a minimum offset of approximately 100 m between the residential boundary and closest perimeter fence of the solar PV panels has been embedded into the design, to retain the open foreground and distant wooded skyline in views currently experienced by residents. This is secured by the Works Plans **[AS-105]**. Hedgerows with hedgerow trees are also proposed along the closest perimeter fence of the solar PV panels to further reduce the visibility of the solar PV infrastructure in views from the property. These will be managed at a height of 3-4 m, whilst individual tree species will be left to reach maturity, as secured by paragraph 5.3.24 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, which is considered to be sufficient to suitably mitigate views of the solar PV panels up to 3.5 m above ground level. It is acknowledged that the proposed planting will take some years to reach a density to provide suitable screening in these views, and this is reflected within the visual assessment for residents of [redacted] and [redacted] contained in Appendix 10-F of the ES **[AS-120]** which concludes a moderate adverse effect at year 1 of operation, reducing to minor adverse effect by year 15. As secured by the Framework LEMP **[AS-122, Paragraph 7.1.7]**) a post-construction monitoring programme (which will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP) comprising walkover surveys of the Order Limits undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.11) results from the post-construction monitoring will feed into the management plan and, if required, management may be amended accordingly based on this monitoring; for example, replacement planting and/or changes to planting species where planting has failed to establish. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Requested Outcomes</u> Regarding the adoption of enforceable buffer zones, it should be noted that appropriate buffers have been built into the Proposed Development design and are secured by the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** and the Environmental Management Plans submitted with the DCO Application. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** provides details of the planting proposed for the Proposed Development and how this will be monitored. The detailed LEMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, is secured through Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Measures to mitigate construction and operational noise to avoid significant adverse noise effects are secured via the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (see Table 6) and the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (see Table 8). Due to the distances between the Proposed Development infrastructure and local properties, high-performance noise barriers would not offer effective acoustic protection, as noise would propagate over such structures leading to similar levels at receptors. Careful selection of plant, including silencer systems and/or enclosures where necessary constitutes a

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			much more effective means of noise mitigation, and Table 8 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** commits to such considerations as part of the procurement process. As noted above, Table 8 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** also commits to the final operational noise levels from the Proposed Development being no higher than those predicted in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** which do not predict any significant effects at this location. Production of a detailed CEMP and OEMP, which are to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plans, will be secured under Requirements 12 and 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. Regarding the community benefit fund, the Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. One way of doing this is by appointing a community foundation which would independently manage the fund, using their local knowledge to identify funding opportunities and help maximise benefits for local communities. Regarding the suggestion of an independent study into alternative site options or a reduced scale, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to identify a suitable site that is as least environmentally constrained as possible whilst delivering the benefits of large-scale solar with regards to the contribution to the delivery of the UK Government's commitment to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. The site selection process for the consideration of potential alternative sites was undertaken in five stages. Following identification of an area of search (Stage 1), all planning and environmental constraints including landscape and heritage were excluded in order to seek to identify a site with no constraints (Stage 2). Following identification of potential sites with all constraints excluded (Stage 3) and their evaluation (Stage 4), it was concluded that the search needed to be widened as it was not possible to identify an appropriate site within the parameters defined for Stages 1 to 4 (Stage 5). Taking account of the suitability of the location for solar infrastructure, the availability of a network connection, appraisal of planning and environmental constraints and willing landowners, the Order Limits was selected to be taken forward for development. Through the process of design evolution, the Applicant has sought to minimise impacts wherever possible. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** provides details of all design changes made in response to feedback received during non-statutory and statutory consultation, the outcomes of environmental assessment and taking account of national and local planning policy.
RR-185	1	Based on comparable sales data for properties within 0.1–0.5 km of utility-scale solar farms, [redacted] stands to lose between 2 % and 6 % of its market value—equivalent to tens of thousands of pounds—through diminished buyer appeal. That financial hit is compounded by the inevitable intrusion on daily life: expansive solar arrays will intrude on key sightlines from principal living areas, mechanical noise from inverters and substation transformers will erode the tranquillity of the home, and glare, shadow flicker and light pollution will further degrade the living environment. Beyond the immediate impact on [redacted] itself, the Proposed Development would irrevocably alter the rural character that defines this corner of North Kesteven. Historic hedgerows and open fields—integral both to the parish's heritage and to policies safeguarding landscape character—would be fragmented or lost, recreational footpaths and wildlife corridors disrupted, and the sense of connectedness between community and countryside undermined. Although the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations require an assessment of environmental impacts, the submitted Environmental Statement underplays the harm to local amenity and cultural heritage, and the scheme fails to satisfy National Policy Statement EN-1's obligation to minimise adverse landscape	<u>Property Market Value</u> In terms of property value, impacts on property prices are not a material consideration under section 104 of the Planning Act 2008, which sets out the matters the Secretary of State must have regard to, which includes the relevant NPSs, which in this case are NPS EN-1, NPS EN-3 and NPS EN5. None of these policy documents consider property prices, and this therefore should not be a factor considered by the Secretary of State when determining the DCO Application. In 2014, the Centre for Economics and Business Research and Renewable UK conducted a study of over one million homes in the UK to analyse the effect of wind farms on house prices. It found that onshore wind farms had no impact on the value of residential properties within a 5km radius. The Applicant notes that this study serves to illustrate the point, given solar panels are visually less obtrusive than wind turbines, as there are no current studies in relation to the solar sector and no conclusive evidence of solar development leading to reduced housing values. <u>Noise</u> As described above in the response to RR-184, no properties are expected to be significantly adversely affected by the noise from the Proposed Development and operational noise at [redacted] [redacted] and [redacted]

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		effects or to conform with locally adopted rural and heritage conservation objectives. Moreover, the proposals for mitigation and screening around [redacted] are inadequate. Gaps in the planned hedgerow belts and bund locations leave key viewpoints exposed, and neither the noise model nor the glare assessment reflects worst-case meteorological conditions. There is no firm commitment to maintain planting or to monitor buffer effectiveness over time. Requested Outcomes: Require the adoption of enforceable buffer zones, multi-layered planting schemes and high-performance noise barriers to secure visual screening and acoustic protection. Establish a transparent compensation and community-benefit fund—administered by an independent panel—to offset property-value losses and amenity degradation. Commission an independent feasibility study into alternative site options or a reduced development footprint to safeguard [redacted] family heritage, landscape character and market value. Summary: I oppose the DCO in its current form and call for its refusal unless the project's location, scale and design are comprehensively revised to prevent adverse impacts on [redacted] [redacted] and [redacted]	(receptor R10 assessed in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**) was assessed to be below the existing background sound level. Additionally, the noise model has assumed reasonable worst-case meteorological conditions. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** makes a commitment that the final operational noise levels from the Proposed Development will be no higher than those predicted in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**; modelling will be undertaken at the detailed design phase (as secured by measure NV-01 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**) to confirm the noise levels at sensitive receptors will not exceed these thresholds. Production of a detailed OEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Furthermore, Requirement 16 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** ensures that the operational noise levels set out in Table 11-21 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** are to be complied with. <u>Glint and glare</u> The glint and glare assessment (Appendix 14-D of the ES **[AS-092]**) modelled an initial bald-earth scenario, with no consideration of local vegetation, other obstacles, and cloud cover, which is considered the worst-case scenario. However, the results of the assessment are based upon a review of the actual visibility of receptors when taking into account topography and local screening (both existing and proposed). This is considered a robust assessment approach, as set out in Appendix 14-D of the ES **[AS-092]**. Receptor 157 of the glint and glare assessment (Appendix 14-D of the ES **[AS-092]**) represents [redacted] [redacted] and [redacted] – the results (ref. paragraph 7.1) show that following the implementation of mitigation (as shown in Figure 7.15-1: Landscape Masterplan, presented within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**), the glint and glare effects at this receptor will be 'None'. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. In relation to the reference to shadow flicker, this is not an environmental constraint associated with the Proposed Development – shadow flicker is often associated with wind turbine developments, as opposed to solar schemes. <u>Light Pollution</u> With regards to light pollution, as secured within the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. LV-O3), the proposed lighting has been designed to avoid light pollution and adverse effects. The mitigation is as follows: • No areas of the Proposed Development will be continuously lit. • Operational lighting will be triggered by Passive Infra-red Detector (PID) systems, which will be installed around the perimeter of the Proposed Development. • Lighting will be directional with care to minimise potential for light spillage beyond the DCO Site particularly towards neighbouring properties, habitats, highways or waterways. • Lights installed will be of the minimum brightness and/or power rating capable of performing the desired function. • Light fittings will be used to reduce the amount of light emitted above the horizontal (reduce upward lighting). • The lighting of the primary substation will be motion sensor triggered, that would operate from dusk. • Low level lighting on specific operational units will be triggered by motion sensors, from dusk. • The inward facing CCTV cameras will typically use night-vision technology and will not require additional lighting. Production of a detailed OEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			<u>Heritage</u> The Applicant has given due regard to the historic landscape components within the Order Limits, with the heritage significance and potential impacts upon the historic landscape resource, including historic hedgerows within the Order Limits boundary, assessed in detail within the Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment of the ES **[APP-128]**. Historic hedgerows are mapped on Figure 7-E-3 **[APP-128]** and as illustrated on Figure 3-2A Indicative Fixed South Facing Site Layout Plan of the ES **[AS-022]** and the Hedgerow Plan **[AS-112]** the layout of the surviving historic hedgerow boundaries will be retained, with breaches only required to facilitate circulation and access, which would not affect the historical integrity of the network of historic hedgerows. Regarding the Environmental Statement underplaying harm to cultural heritage, the Proposed taking into account heritage constraints. The design was informed by staged assessment work in order to remove or reduce potential impacts upon heritage assets, and reflects a proactive approach to identifying, assessing and mitigating impacts (please refer to Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially Appendix 7-B Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment **[APP-125]**, Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]**, and Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment **[APP-128]**). , which detail the comprehensive level of assessment work undertaken. As such, the Applicant is of the opinion that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the significance of the cultural heritage resource and the potential impact of the Proposed Development upon this resource, and measures have been built into the process to ensure appropriate and proportionate mitigation is included. <u>Wildlife Corridors</u> As set out in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** (ref. paragraphs 8.13.5 and 8.13.6), and secured by the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, woodland buffers and native tree belts to be implemented as part of the proposed landscaping are characteristic of the existing landscape and provide ecological value, forming important wildlife corridors between existing woodlands. Furthermore, new hedgerows with trees will be established to supplement the existing, retained hedgerows with trees. These will provide a valuable habitat, forming important wildlife corridors and re-enforcing existing ones. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Footpaths</u> Regarding the disruption of footpaths, as set out in Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, (ref. paragraph 13.7.33), all PRoW which will require temporary diversions/construction route crossing points or permanent diversions have been classed as having low or medium magnitude and low or very low sensitivity (apart from P11 which has medium sensitivity). The Severance impacts for PRoW receptors P11, P18, P23, P25 and P43 have been assessed as Minor and the Severance impact for all other PRoW receptors has been assessed as Negligible – i.e. no significant adverse effects upon PRoW. Furthermore, the Applicant has committed to creating approximately 9.5km of new permissive paths (to be secured by Requirement 8 and Requirement 17 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**) to supplement the existing PRoW network, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages. The proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, providing more effective linkages across the site. A Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** has also been prepared and submitted with the DCO application – this document outlines how the Applicant will manage PRoW within the Order Limits to ensure they have been suitably considered and will continue to operate effectively throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. This management plan reviews both user safety and accessibility, during the complete life cycle of the Proposed Development, considering the potential interaction and impact on the PRoW associated with the construction works, as well as the day-to-day operation of the Proposed Development.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			Production of a detailed PRoWMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 18 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Visual Impact, Landscape and Planting With regard to the mitigation around [redacted] a minimum offset of approximately 100 m between the residential boundary and closest perimeter fence of the solar PV panels has been embedded, to retain the open foreground and distant wooded skyline in views currently experienced by residents. This is secured by the Works Plans **[AS-105]**. Hedgerows with hedgerow trees are also proposed along the closest perimeter fence of the solar PV panels to further reduce the visibility of the solar PV infrastructure in views from the property. These will be managed at a height of 3-4 m, whilst individual tree species will be left to reach maturity, as secured by paragraph 5.3.24 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, which is considered to be sufficient to suitably mitigate views of the solar PV panels up to 3.5 m above ground level. It is acknowledged that the proposed planting will take some years to reach a density to provide suitable screening in these views, and this is reflected within the visual assessment for residents of [redacted] and [redacted] contained in Appendix 10-F of the ES **[AS-120]** which concludes a moderate adverse effect at year 1 of operation, reducing to minor adverse effect by year 15. As secured by the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, Paragraph 7.1.7]) a post-construction monitoring programme (which will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP) comprising walkover surveys of the Order Limits undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.11) results from the post-construction monitoring will feed into the management plan and, if required, management may be amended accordingly based on this monitoring; for example, replacement planting and/or changes to planting species where planting has failed to establish. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Requested Outcomes Regarding the adoption of enforceable buffer zones, it should be noted that appropriate buffers have been built into the Proposed Development Design and are secured by the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** and the Environmental Management Plans submitted with the DCO Application. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** provides details of the planting proposed and monitoring for the Proposed Development. The LEMP is secured through Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Measures to mitigate construction and operational noise to avoid significant adverse noise effects are secured via the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (see Table 6) and the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (see Table 8). Due to the distances between the Proposed Development infrastructure and local properties, high-performance noise barriers would not offer effective acoustic protection, as noise would propagate over such structures leading to similar levels at receptors. Careful selection of plant, including silencer systems and/or enclosures where necessary constitutes a much more effective means of noise mitigation, and Table 8 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** commits to such considerations as part of the procurement process. As noted above, Table 8 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** also commits to the final operational noise levels from the Proposed Development being no higher than those predicted in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**. Production of a detailed CEMP and OEMP, which are to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plans, will be secured under Requirements 12 and 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. Regarding the community benefit fund, the Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. One way of doing this is by appointing a community foundation which would independently manage the fund, using their local knowledge to identify funding opportunities and help maximise benefits for local communities.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			Regarding the suggestion of an independent study into alternative site options or a reduced scale, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to identify a suitable site that is as least environmentally constrained as possible whilst delivering the benefits of large-scale solar with regards to the contribution to the delivery of the UK Government's commitment to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. The site selection process for the consideration of potential alternative sites was undertaken in five stages. Following identification of an area of search (Stage 1), all planning and environmental constraints including landscape and heritage were excluded in order to seek to identify a site with no constraints (Stage 2). Following identification of potential sites with all constraints excluded (Stage 3) and their evaluation (Stage 4), it was concluded that the search needed to be widened as it was not possible to identify an appropriate site within the parameters defined for Stages 1 to 4 (Stage 5). Taking account of the suitability of the location for solar infrastructure, the availability of a network connection, appraisal of planning and environmental constraints and willing landowners, the Order Limits was selected to be taken forward for development. Through the process of design evolution, the Applicant has sought to minimise impacts wherever possible. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** provides details of all design changes made in response to feedback received during non-statutory and statutory consultation, the outcomes of environmental assessment and taking account of national and local planning policy.
RR-190	1	Primarily it is simply wrong to commit good agricultural land to 40 years of non food production. By committing to loose such an amount of land will result in the UK having to import vast amounts of food for the foreseeable future which will result in the UK not having any control over the price we pay for these food imports. Whilst I recognise we need control over future energy costs and solar is a possible part solution all solar projects should be firstly on the roofs of industrial warehouses etc. Also brown field ex industrial sites need to be used.	With regards to the loss of agricultural land as a result of the Proposed Development, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents a very small portion of the total farmland in the East Midlands (approximately 0.09% (1,018.7ha)). Furthermore, approximately 50% of the land within the proposed principal site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. While the land use is predominantly agricultural, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development is therefore unlikely to result in an impact on food production or an increase of food imports. The Site has been carefully selected through a staged process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It should be noted that the Proposed Development recognises the need to allow current farming practices to continue. The Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is also important to note that any loss of agricultural production due to the Proposed Development would be temporary. The Applicant is seeking consent for a 60-year operational period – under Requirement 20 of the draft Development Consent Order **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational period the infrastructure will be removed and the land returned to the landowner for future use, in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, secured through the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, and the land would be available for its current use. Production of a detailed DEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regards to exploring the scope to utilise rooftops and non-agricultural land (such as warehouses and brownfield sites) for development, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. No brownfield sites of a sufficient size were identified that provide adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, 2 of the 3 sites identified had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site, Hawdin's Wood, included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield which was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises the important role played by energy alternatives such as decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land for example in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller-scale energy schemes will contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar remains an essential component of the future electricity system and must be delivered where the solar resource is available, land is suitable and available, and where there is proximity to viable grid connection points, such as in the area surrounding the Proposed Development, in accordance with the overarching need established in NPS EN-1 and the technology-specific policy support for renewable energy infrastructure set out in NPS EN-3. As stated in Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3), while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. Due consideration has been given to these land types within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. However, as mentioned above, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.
RR-206	1	I oppose the project because of its size and the cumulative impact on the countryside as a local amenity. I believe solar should be on rooftops and brownfield sites and not on productive agricultural land. Furthermore, the applicant has not considered any reasonable alternatives to this site.	<u>Cumulative Impact and Local Amenity</u> The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the cumulative impact of the Proposed Development on the countryside and local amenity. A detailed Cumulative Effects Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions **[APP-040]**.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			The cumulative effects assessment included an assessment of cumulative impacts between the Proposed Development together with other proposed projects and land allocations. As summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. paragraph 15.5.24), significant adverse cumulative effects are only identified on landscape and visual amenity receptors, however the significance of effect attributed to the Proposed Development alone is not increased when considering these other developments alongside the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The following significant cumulative effects were established during construction, where the magnitude of effect is higher than that of the Proposed Development in isolation. During construction: • Major Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects upon the North Kesteven District landscape sub-area Witham and Brant Vales due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction. Additionally, changes are anticipated to the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way (PRoW Cole/2/1 and BooG/2/2) as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID95 Application Reference: PL/0087/23, North Hykeham Relief Road, resulting in a Major adverse effect which is significant. • Moderate Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects on the North Kesteven landscape sub-area Limestone Heath due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID63 Application Reference: EN010149, Springwell Energy Farm and ID103 Application Reference: EN0110016, Leoda Solar Farm, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect which is significant. During operation (year 15) it is considered there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that, given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. The Proposed Development has been subject to an iterative design process to minimise impacts on local amenity. Embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated such as new planting, enhanced management of existing vegetation, and the introduction of offsets to reduce visibility of infrastructure from nearby settlements. These measures are designed to reduce the visual dominance of the development and limit the contribution of the Proposed Development to cumulative impacts. Additionally, the Applicant has committed to creating approximately 9.5km of new permissive paths to supplement the existing PRoW network, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local amenity. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. The landscaping design and proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, providing more effective linkages across the site. <u>Use of Solar on Agricultural Land and Reasonable Alternatives</u>

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			With regards to exploring the scope to utilise rooftops and non-agricultural land (such as warehouses and brownfield sites) for development, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. Three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of the sites was large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres). The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Therefore, no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, 2 of the 3 sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site, Hawdin's Wood, included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, however given the site has been developed for a range of uses, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such as decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on its own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. These land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. With regards to the loss of agricultural land as a result of the Proposed Development, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha (3.7 acres) of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			It should be noted that the Proposed Development recognises the need to allow current farming practices to continue. The Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is also important to note that any loss of agricultural production due to the Proposed Development would be temporary. The Applicant is seeking consent for a 60-year operational period – under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational period the infrastructure will be removed and the land returned to the landowner for future use, in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, secured through the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, and the land would be available for its current use. Production of a detailed DEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-208	1	Loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land / Food Security: • The project is proposed for a large area of farmland, including land classed as 'Best and Most Versatile' (BMV) agricultural land. • Using this prime food-producing land for solar panels compromises UK food security. Scale and Concentration of Development: • This as an industrial-scale development that covers a vast area and is too large and dominating for the rural landscape. • Fosse Green and other solar NSIPs being proposed in the local area (e.g., Springwell, Beacon Fen, Heckington Fen), will carpet vast swathes of the countryside. Landscape and Visual Impact: • The development is detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the rural countryside. • The size and height of the panels and associated infrastructure (fencing, security lighting, battery storage) are inappropriate. Planning Process and Strategy: • There should be an overarching strategic spatial strategy for renewable energy across the country instead of multiple large scale projects like Fosse Green being clustered in one area i.e. Lincolnshire. • The local authority and communities are disempowered because they are not the determining authority for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.	<u>Loss of BMV Agricultural Land / Food Security</u> The use of agricultural land, including BMV land, has been carefully considered through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the withdrawal of land from agricultural production has been established as a minor adverse effect. With regards to the concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon agricultural production, as considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the 1,018.7 ha (2687.76 acres) of agricultural land required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Moreover, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Proposed Development has also been designed recognising the need to allow current farming practices to continue where possible. The Order Limits includes a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181 ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116 ha (286.64 acres) of

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		• Planning rules should be prioritising solar on commercial roofs, car parks, and brownfield sites over open countryside. Not prime agricultural land. Environmental and Other Impacts: • There is too great a potential for impacts such as glint and glare, noise and vibration, and flood risk, and the effect on wildlife and biodiversity (despite developer proposals for biodiversity net gain). • The safety and siting of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) required for this project is wholly inappropriate, once again, being sited on prime agricultural land.	Subgrade 3a BMV land. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. <u>Scale and Concentration of Development</u> With regards to the scale of the Proposed Development, as detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]** smaller scale solar schemes, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets for renewable energy generation and achieving net zero. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that large-scale solar is an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development. Paragraph 3.3.1 states that *"Electricity meets a significant proportion of our overall energy needs and our reliance on it will increase as we transition our energy system to deliver our net zero target".* Paragraph 3.3.12 explains that *"decentralised and community energy systems such as micro-generation contribute to our targets on reducing carbon emissions and increasing energy security. These technologies could also lead to some reduction in demand on the main generation and transmission system. However, the government does not believe they will replace the need for new large-scale electricity infrastructure to meet our energy objectives. This is because connection of large-scale, centralised electricity generating facilities via a high voltage transmission system enables the pooling of both generation and demand, which in turn offers a number of economic and other benefits, such as more efficient bulk transfer of power and enabling surplus generation capacity in one area to be used to cover shortfalls elsewhere."* The Applicant acknowledges that there is the potential for cumulative effects as a result of the combined impact of the Proposed Development together with other energy schemes proposed in the area and recognises local concerns regarding the concentration of energy developments in Lincolnshire. A detailed cumulative effects assessment has been provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the Environmental Statement **[APP-040]**. The cumulative effects assessment followed a staged approach and considered relevant developments and land allocations within a 10km radius from the Proposed Development, as agreed with the Local Authorities. A wider county level study area was used for the cumulative effects assessment in relation to BMV agricultural land which considers other Solar NSIPs within the County of Lincolnshire. The cumulative effects assessment included an assessment of cumulative impacts between the Proposed Development together with other energy projects, including NSIPs that are located in close proximity to the Proposed Development. As summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. paragraph 15.5.24), significant adverse cumulative effects are only identified on landscape and visual amenity receptors, however the significance of effect attributed to the Proposed Development alone is not increased when considering these other developments alongside the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The following significant cumulative effects were established during construction, where the magnitude of effect is higher than that of the Proposed Development in isolation. During construction: • Major Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects upon the North Kesteven District landscape sub-area Witham and Brant Vales due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction. Additionally, changes are anticipated to the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way (PRoW Cole/2/1 and BooG/2/2) as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID95 Application Reference: PL/0087/23, North Hykeham Relief Road, resulting in a Major adverse effect which is significant. • Moderate Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects on the North Kesteven landscape sub-area Limestone Heath due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			would be perceived during construction as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID63 Application Reference: EN010149, Springwell Energy Farm and ID103 Application Reference: EN0110016, Leoda Solar Farm, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect which is significant. During operation (year 15) it is considered there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within the Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton Solar Project **[EN010132]**, and Cottam Solar Project **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that, given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. <u>Landscape and Visual Impact</u> The Applicant acknowledges that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Receptors will be most impacted during the construction phase, and the number of significant effects will drop by half at Year 1 of operation. The significant effects will further reduce as the mitigation planting becomes further established by Year 15 (a chosen year of assessment to align with industry practices), replacing the vegetation lost at the construction phase, enhancing landscape pattern, and helping integrate the Proposed Development within the surrounding landscape. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** outlines the landscape and ecology impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Proposed Development, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Proposed Development is operational. Production of a detailed LEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regards to the part of the comment that the size and height of the panels and associated infrastructure are inappropriate, it should be noted that the design parameters of the Proposed Development are consistent with other consented solar schemes. It should also be noted that, to allow for flexibility and enable the optimal design of the Proposed Development post-consent, maximum/minimum parameters have been defined for the Proposed Development. As such, the final detailed design will not exceed these parameters set and may well be lower. The mitigation embedded within the design of the Proposed Development, secured by the various management plans, has also been developed with the maximum parameters in mind – for example, the Framework CEMP **[APP-089]** (ref.GG-C1) notes native hedgerows will be planted/infilled and maintained to deliver a minimum height at least the same as the upper edge of the panels. Measures such as these will ensure that adverse effects are suitably mitigated in line with the ES assessments regardless of the final detailed design, given that the final design will be within the defined design parameters. Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Rochdale Envelope approach has been adopted for environmental assessment, as set out in Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**. The Rochdale Envelope provides a framework for assessing the maximum (and where relevant, minimum) parameters, including the limits of deviation (e.g. development extents or specific maximum heights) as relevant, for the Proposed Development where flexibility needs to be retained. This approach also ensures that the worst-case scenario is assessed. The result is that the impacts of the Proposed Development will only be equal to or less than those concluded in the assessments of the ES.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			The size and height of the panels can also help mitigate negative impacts. For example, the solar PV panels proposed for Proposed Development will have a minimum ground clearance above ground level of 0.8 m. As stated in Section 12.6 Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.6.4) this could support sheep grazing, and also capitalise on the opportunity to improve soil structure during the period of suspended agricultural activities during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. <u>Planning Process and Strategy</u> Regarding an overarching strategic spatial strategy for renewable energy across the country, the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP) and Centralised Strategic Network Plan are in the early stages of development and are yet to be published. The SSEP is still in development, with the methodology published in May 2025. The final SSEP is not yet available, with the first iteration of the SSEP expected to be published for public consultation in Q2 2026. For decision making, the Proposed Development is defined as a NSIP, as it consists of the construction of an onshore generating station in England with a capacity exceeding 50 MW in accordance with s14(1)(a), s15(1) and s15(2) of the Planning Act 2008. As such, due to being it defined as nationally significant, it is for the Secretary of State to make a decision on the Proposed Development. NKDC and LCC are the host authorities and have been consulted throughout the process so far and will continue to be involved during the Examination of the application. They will each have the opportunity to prepare a Local Impact Report (LIR) now that the DCO application has been accepted for Examination. The LIR will be considered by the Secretary of State when determining the DCO application in line with s104(2)(b) of the Planning Act 2008. With regards to consulting the local community, the consultation process was designed to engage with those local communities who may be most affected by the Proposed Development. The Applicant defined a Core Consultation Zone of 3 km from the site which received a direct mailing at each consultation and a Wider Consultation Zone of 5 km from the site. This was to reach interested individuals or parties who were not only within the Core Consultation Zone. The Applicant also consulted with stakeholders including elected representatives, seldom heard groups, landowners, community organisations and statutory stakeholders as defined in s42 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant used a range of methods to share information about the proposals and to reach different audiences. This included digital methods - a project website, holding webinars and hosting online feedback forms, as well as holding in-person events and sending hard-copy letters to residents and other stakeholders. The consultation process was open to anyone who wished to take part and feedback could be given by letter, feedback form or email. Following submission of the DCO application the Applicant's website remains open and includes information on how to get in touch with the Applicant to share their views. Submitting Relevant Representations allows individuals to become "interested parties" for the purposes of the Examination to enable them to continue have their say in relation to the DCO Application. With regards to exploring the scope to utilise rooftops and non-agricultural land (such as brownfield sites) for development, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. Three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of the sites was large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40 ha (99 acres), therefore no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, 2 of the 3 sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site, Hawdin's Wood, included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, however given the site has been developed for a range of uses, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development.

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. These land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. <u>Environmental and Other Impacts</u> The Applicant recognises that the Proposed Development will result in some residual adverse effects on people within the surrounding rural communities. However, as summarised in Chapter 16: Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**, the Proposed Development will not result in significant residual adverse effects on glint and glare, noise, flood risk, and on wildlife and biodiversity. With regards to vibration, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** establishes that there is the potential for temporary significant moderate adverse vibration effects on three sensitive receptors. This is due to vibration from noise generating construction works if driven piling is undertaken at a distance of 60 m or closer to these properties, associated with construction of the BESS, Solar Stations, and ground mounted solar PV panel arrays, based on worst-case parameters. This is considered to be a precautionary approach to construction vibration and likely to over-estimate vibration levels. If driven piling is to be undertaken, a commitment is included in the Framework CEMP **[APP-089]** to undertake a construction vibration risk assessment such that significant effects would be avoided. If it is unavoidable that the relevant levels would be exceeded, the risk assessment would focus on limiting the exposure of nearby receptors to levels of vibration exceeding the relevant thresholds as far as reasonably practicable. Furthermore, the timing of any driven piling within 60m of residential receptors will be delayed until after 10am to avoid more sensitive time periods. Again, these significant effects would only occur for the short-term duration during which the driven piling works (if undertaken) are happening near to these residences. Management and mitigation measures have been included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-089]** to minimise these impacts as far as practical. Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Secretary of State will need to balance impacts and changes against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in Government policy. The Applicant has committed to mitigating impacts wherever possible, and the impacts to local communities have been carefully evaluated by technical assessments. The Applicant considers that the layout presented in the DCO Application represents a good design that has located infrastructure sensitively with good buffers from receptors and incorporates a good planting scheme. The

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains the design principles that were developed at an early stage, and which provided a framework for evolution of the design of the Proposed Development. The design principles were informed by national and local planning policy and the outcomes of environmental assessment. With regards to the comment regarding Battery Storage, the Applicant has committed to ensure a minimum buffer of 150m from the distributed BESS units to residential receptors, and 200m from the centralised BESS units to residential receptors, as set out within the Framework BSMP (ref. paragraph 2.3.5) **[APP-198]** (which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline) which will avoid significant effects on nearby receptors in the unlikely event of a fire. Appendix 14-G: Unplanned Emissions Assessment **[APP-176]** assesses the impact of airborne chemicals and gases produced in the event of a BESS fire and shows that the dilution of gases and the distance from the BESS is sufficient to avoid any exceedances of airborne gas safety levels. Furthermore, a variety of assessments have been carried out to address any potential areas of risk from the BESS as detailed in the Environmental Statement **[APP-025 - APP-179]**. The Proposed Development includes embedded design mitigation (see paragraph above and below) and protection measures to reduce fire/explosion risk are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. These measures include, for example, an automatic cooling system which will be integrated into the BESS to stop or reduce the risk of a cell from overheating and failing and triggering a chain reaction in neighbouring cells. Under Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** a detailed BSMP must be submitted to LCC for approval which must prescribe measures to facilitate safety during construction, operation and decommissioning of the BESS. This detailed BSMP must be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP and LCC must consult with LFRS and the Environment Agency before approving the BSMP. The BESS is designed so that in the event one cell overheats/catches fire, there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent which it is possible to control this)). This layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. The LFRS would be expected to let a BESS fire burn out, but the focus of the Framework BSMP is to prevent a fire occurring. There have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development.
	2	Construction Traffic Disruption: • Concerns about the volume of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements during the construction phase which will be using small, local, and rural roads for construction vehicles. These roads are unsuitable and a risk to road users, pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders. • The potential for temporary but intense disruption to local amenity and tranquillity due to increased (large vehicle) traffic movement. Increased Flood Risk: • The development's location in areas with flood risk and the potential for the hard surfaces of the solar panels and infrastructure to alter local drainage and increase flood risk. Compulsory Acquisition Powers: • The developer should not be seeking compulsory purchase powers for parcels of land if the need for that land has not been proven essential	<u>Construction Traffic Disruption</u> An assessment of the potential effects relating to additional construction traffic including on severance, driver delay, and accidents and safety is carried out within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legalisation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A **[APP-163]**. This assessment considers vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders, when establishing the sensitivity of road links and junctions assessed, as noted in Tabe 13-7 of Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. This assessment concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. The assessment has used the shortest expected construction programme (24 months), which provides a worst-case scenario in terms of construction vehicle trips as this is based on a rapid, and so shorter, construction period that would generate the highest number of peak hour and daily road trips on the local network. LCC and National Highways in their respective capacities as local highways authority and highways authority for the strategic road networks, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. An HGV routing plan is shown on Figure 13-4: Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Routing **[AS-072]** of the ES, identifying the key routes which will be used by HGVs to travel to/ from each site access. The only section of road with a 7.5 tonne weight restriction which is proposed for use by construction traffic associated with the Proposed

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
		for the project or that the scheme is not a compelling public interest case justifying such powers.	Development, is Fosse Lane north of the junction with the A46 (heading towards Thorpe on the Hill). However, construction vehicles will only utilise a short distance of this road before accessing construction access C-002 (see Figure 3-1 Construction Compound and Access Locations of the ES **[AS-021]**), some distance south of the village. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures, and where necessary enforcement, to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. A commitment that road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/ verges during the construction phase of the Proposed Development is also made in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**. The production of a detailed CTMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, is secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. A Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** has also been prepared and submitted with the DCO application – this document outlines how the Applicant will manage PRoW within the Order Limits to ensure they have been suitably considered and will continue to operate effectively throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. This report reviews both user safety and accessibility, during the complete life cycle of the Proposed Development, considering the potential interaction and impact on the PRoW associated with the construction works, as well as the day-to-day operation of the Proposed Development. Production of a detailed PRoWMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirement 18 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Regarding tranquillity, an assessment of construction traffic noise has been carried out and the results considered in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**. The assessment established no likely significant effects associated with construction traffic noise. <u>Increased Flood Risk</u> A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared within Appendix 9-C of the ES **[APP-146]**. The Flood Risk Assessment assesses flood risk from all sources and ensures that the Proposed Development does not increase flood risk to the Proposed Development or elsewhere, in line with national and local planning requirements. A sequential approach has been taken in locating infrastructure to avoid areas of flood risk, in line with NPS EN- 1 and the National Planning Policy Framework. All proposed buildings/compound areas, substation, transformers stations, BESS and the majority of panels have been located outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3. The majority of the Principal Site is located within an area classified as Flood Zone 1 (Low Risk). Solar PV panels and mounting structures will not increase surface water risk as they do not alter the existing drainage regime. Flood risk from all sources within and surrounding the Order limits will remain unchanged with the embedded mitigation proposed. An outline drainage strategy, presented within Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS of the ES **[APP-147]**, has been prepared alongside the Flood Risk Assessment which sets out the approach to surface water management. Surface water runoff from new, impermeable, surfaces will be attenuated and drained to surface water bodies, either to watercourses, or in certain cases to ground where a watercourse is not present in the vicinity. Discharges to watercourses from new impermeable areas will be mitigated by restricting runoff rates to the greenfield rate Qbar (an estimation tool that estimates site runoff rates based on site characteristics using standard hydrological equations), for all design storm return periods, attenuating excess runoff within the Order limits; therefore, reducing surface water flood risk downstream. <u>Compulsory Acquisition Powers</u>

RR Ref No.	Section	Comments from Relevant Representations	Response to Relevant Representation
			The site selection process, as detailed in Planning Statement Appendix A: Site Selection Report **[AS-098]**, sought to reduce the need for the use of Compulsory Acquisition powers. The availability of willing landowners was an important consideration and suitable landowners were approached by the Applicant to discuss inclusion of their landholdings into the Proposed Development. All of the land over which the Applicant is seeking powers of compulsory acquisition satisfies the conditions in section 122 of the Planning Act 2008, and the considerations set out in the Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land' (September 2013). The Statement of Reasons **[APP-020]** explains in detail why it is necessary, proportionate and justifiable for the DCO Application to seek powers of compulsory acquisition, and why there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Applicant to be granted these powers. Specifically, the Applicant is only seeking to rely on compulsory acquisition powers where it is not possible to acquire land or rights in land by voluntary agreement with affected landowners. The Applicant now has 88% of the Principal Site under Option and 75% of the landowners within the Cable Corridor under Heads of Terms, being progressed to Option. The Applicant is seeking to secure the rest of the land for the Principal Site and Cable Corridor by way of voluntary agreement. Use of compulsory acquisition powers if granted would be limited to where it was not possible to rely on voluntary agreements, if there were other rights or restrictions on the land that could impact the delivery of the Proposed Development, or if, despite carry out diligent enquiry, it had not been possible to identify the landowners or rights holders of the land. In those circumstances it would be in the public interest for the Applicant to use compulsory acquisition powers and for the affected persons to be able to claim for compensation. The Applicant has detailed it's response above in relation to the need for the Proposed Development, and this feeds into demonstrating the necessity required in order to satisfy the requirements for the granting of compulsory acquisition powers over land.

7. Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations

7.1 General Public: Climate Change / Net Zero

Table 7-1: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero
RR-222	Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Relation to the Proposed Development	The Applicant states that GHG emissions from the manufacture of solar PV Panels will be 110,110 tCO2e (for 1,085,000 panels?). The proposed Springwell Solar Farm with 1,500,000 panels, also manufactured in China using coal generated power, state that emissions, including transportation would be 1,009,233 tCO2e. The Springwell Applicant would have no reason to inflate such a key figure. The Fosse Green figure is clearly too low. If the equivalent data from Springwell were applied to Fosse Green, the emission figure for the manufacture of the solar PV panels would be circa 730,000 tCO2e. Given the unpredictable nature of the direction of climate change initiatives in China, and adopting the Rochdale Envelope worst case approach, this 730,000 figure should be used for emissions associated with initial manufacture and future replacement panels. One possible reason, though not justification, for a 60 year time consent development is it results in a lower carbon intensity figure. If the development was 40 years, the lifetime GHG emissions would not greatly change as the vast majority are generated from manufacturing emissions, and the generation figure would drop from 19,438,499 MWh to approximately 13,000,000 MWh. This would increase the carbon intensity figure to circa 58 gCO2e/kWh, an even worse figure when compared to the carbon intensity figure of other renewables such as nuclear and wind which both sit about 12 gCO2e/kWh. Even for a 60 year lifetime, if a GHG equivalent figure similar to that of the proposed Springwell Solar Farm for manufacturing the solar PV panels was used, the lifetime emission figure would increase by about 619,890 tCO2e to 1,335,814 (this is excluding emissions from replacements at the 30 year point), resulting in a carbon intensity of circa 69 gCO2e/kWh.	The methodology and the Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs) used for assessing the carbon impact of the solar panels are set out in paragraph 6.4.31 of Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-031]**. These are in line with best practice and have been accepted in similar DCO projects by the planning inspectorate. The 60-year operational life of the Proposed Development does not result in a lower carbon intensity figure as the assessment in Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-031]** assumes that the solar panels will be replaced at Year 30 and is therefore a worst-case estimate of the carbon intensity of the Proposed Development. By comparison, Springwell Solar Farm has a 40-year operational life with no panel replacement. The carbon assessment undertaken is in line with best practice and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidance[20] and finds that the Proposed Development is in line with the UK's trajectory to net zero. As established in Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-031]** (ref. paragraph 6.4.70), over the 60-year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the lifetime operational carbon intensity is a value of 25 gCO2e/kWh (which is overwhelmingly due to emissions from replacement components rather than the operation of the Proposed Development). As such, the operational carbon intensity of the Proposed Development is 88% lower than that of the grid average, which sits at 207 gCO2e/kWh in 2025 – i.e. each kilowatt hour of electricity generated by the Proposed Development will emit 182 gCO2e less than if it was generated by the national grid. Section 6.2 of Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-031]**, sets out the relevant policy and legislation with respect to greenhouse gas emissions which make clear the need for the Proposed Development and solar energy generation to achieve the UK's Net Zero targets.
RR-226, RR-250	The Paris Agreement (2015)	Article 2 of the Paris Agreement (COP21, 2015) aims "to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change". Paragraph 1b emphasises the need to increase "the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production..." How does a solar farm covering thousands of hectares of agricultural land uphold this claim?	The potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon food production is considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[APP-037]**. It is important to place the scale and nature of land use into context. As considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited

[20] IEMA (2022) Environmental Impact Assessment Guide to: Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero
			and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which allows current farming practices to continue whilst also providing other benefits, such as mitigation for ground nesting birds. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV agricultural land. Furthermore, to minimise the impacts of the Proposed Development on BMV land Chapter 12: Socio-Economic and Land Use of the ES **[APP-037]** (ref. paragraph 12.6.4) sets out embedded mitigation measures, including the use of panels at a height, which could support sheep grazing throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The Framework SMP **[APP-192]** a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured via Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, contains industry standard good practice mitigation measures to reduce impacts on soil which will ensure that the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade of soils will be unaltered through operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
RR-096, RR-152, RR-177, RR-249	Carbon Footprint of Solar Development	Solar energy is not the "clean" energy it is portrayed as. It is not particularly efficient when compared to wind power, and has a larger carbon footprint. There are other more efficient forms of electricity generation. As well as concerns about the use of slave labour, there are concerns about the coal-fired energy in the production of the panels, plus the carbon cost of shipping them all the way here from China.	Other forms of electricity generation, such as wind power, nuclear, coal, tidal, or gas fired power stations, have not been assessed due to their unsuitability at the Site (in the case of a large-scale wind project and nuclear energy) or their inability to contribute to the UK's need for low-carbon electricity (in the case of coal or gas). With regards to efficiency, solar produces similar amounts of energy per ha per year as onshore wind. As per Section 6.4.67 to 6.4.73 of Chapter 6 Climate Change **[APP-031]** over the 60-year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the lifetime operational carbon intensity is a value of 25 gCO2e/kWh, which is overwhelmingly due to emissions from replacement components rather than the operation of the Proposed Development. The operational intensity of the Proposed Development is 88% lower than that of the grid average which sits at 207 gCO2e/kWh in 2025. Each kilowatt hour of electricity generated by the Proposed Development will emit 182 gCO2e less than if it was generated by the national grid. Combining this figure with the estimated lifetime output from the Proposed Development indicates an overall lifetime carbon saving, relative to the counterfactual grid average of the current (2025) energy mix, of 3,302,906 tCO2e. The carbon payback period for construction emissions is approximately 4 years of operation. Considering that the initial role of solar and other renewable energy generation is to displace fossil fuels such as gas from the grid, a payback period can be calculated when considering displacement of unabated CCGT. This would be two years for the emissions in the construction phase of the Proposed Development. This will help the UK meet its national and international binding targets including the UK's Carbon Budget and the Nationally Determined Contributions in line with the Paris Agreement. The UK Government has committed to achieving Net Zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 under the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Solar generation plays a vital role in this transition. According to the Seventh Carbon Budget, over 60% of emissions reductions required

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero
			between now and 2050 must come from electrification and low-carbon electricity production, enabling a rapid shift toward clean electricity and the electrification of other sectors such as transport and heating. Large-scale solar is an essential part of this shift. It is a proven, scalable technology capable of rapid deployment with minimal environmental impact and low operational emissions. As the UK decarbonises its economy, demand for electricity is projected to double by 2040. With the Clean Power Target of 45- 47 GW of solar generation capacity by 2030, and 45-69 GW by 2035, largescale projects such as the Proposed Development will be crucial to meeting this benchmark. As an essential component of the future electricity system, large-scale solar must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching NPS EN-1. The reasoning behind the need for the Proposed Development is set out fully in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector*." Paragraph 2.10.10 of NPS EN-3 goes on to confirm that solar has an important role in delivering the government's goals for greater energy independence including those of the British Energy Security Strategy which sets out that the government expects a five-fold increase in combined ground and rooftop solar deployment by 2035 (up to 70GW). The Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and has provided for this to be a legal obligation under the DCO. This will be achieved through the development of a detailed ESSCP, which will be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with the DCO application, as secured under Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Framework ESSCP includes a commitment (ref. paragraph 3.4.8) that any qualifying supplier must participate in a modern slavery supplier due diligence exercise, and the supplier must publish annually a slavery and human trafficking statement that meets the statutory requirements of section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015, whereby the supplier must pay and treat its workers in compliance with applicable employment laws and minimum wage requirements. Further details regarding ethical and environmental responsibilities are provided in the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**. It is noted that the Rule 6 letter **[PD-008]**, Appendix F, notes that issues concerning ethical procurement of imported plant and equipment are relevant to the UK's trade policy and international relations, rather than being land use planning considerations under the Planning Act 2008.
RR-035, RR-204, RR-261	No Climate Crisis	The Proposed Development is unnecessary as there is no climate crisis or need for Net Zero plans.	The Applicant disagrees that the Proposed Development is unnecessary, whereby the scientific evidence supporting the reality of the climate crisis is overwhelming. The decarbonisation of all sectors is essential in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050 as per the Climate Change Act 2008. Increasing solar generation plays a key part in this – as stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands. NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero
			for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector*." Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as vital for a decarbonised grid and is able to support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear. The need for the Proposed Development is set out fully in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. Section 6.2 of Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-031]**, sets out the relevant legislation and policy with respect to greenhouse gas emissions which make clear the need for the Proposed Development and solar energy generation in general to achieve the UK's Net Zero targets. Large-scale solar is an essential part of the future electricity system which must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching NPS EN-1. The Proposed Development represents a significant opportunity in this respect and would provide a significant contribution to the delivery of the UK Government's commitment to achieve net zero emissions by 2050.
RR-126, RR-187	Net Zero Approach	Although going green may be necessary, the UK is not taking the correct approach. Other countries are funding research into alternative energy generation whilst the UK lags behind.	It should be noted that the UK has one of the most ambitious decarbonisation frameworks in the world – the UK Government has committed to achieving Net Zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 under the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended), whereby the UK has cut emissions by roughly 50% since 1990, faster than any other major economy in the G7. As the UK decarbonises its economy, demand for electricity is projected to double by 2040. With the Clean Power Target of 45- 47 GW of solar generation capacity by 2030, and 45-69 GW by 2035[21], large-scale projects such as the Proposed Development will be crucial to meeting this benchmark – this is recognised in the NPSs, where NPS EN-1 identifies that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and NPS EN-3 recognises solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). The need for the Proposed Development is set out fully in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. In relation to the point about research into alternative energy generation, solar energy is a proven, scalable technology capable of rapid deployment with minimal environmental impact and low operational emissions. This is recognised in NPS EN-1, whereby solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands.
RR-115	Knock on Impact on Decarbonisation	The application tries to minimise the loss of productive agricultural land by highlighting that not all the product is for human consumption. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it can be assumed that the loss of this land for feeding animals and biomass will have to be replaced by land used elsewhere for human food production. For	The Applicant acknowledges that the respondent is correct that some of the crops grown on the Site currently are for biofuels; some for distillation into bioethanol as an additive to petrol and some for incineration in biomass facilities to generate electricity. Research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is

[21] Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (2025) Policy Paper – Clean Power 2030 Action Plan: A new era of clean electricity – main report

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Climate Change / Net Zero
		example, closure of the biomass facilities would have an adverse impact of decarbonisation so it is reasonable to assume that alternative land for their supply would have to found to avoid this.	grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. Previous solar NSIPs have demonstrated during Examination stage that Solar PV generates more electricity per acre of land than biofuels. As more cars on the road network become electric, the electricity will also power these and the need for bioethanol is expected to reduce. As noted in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[APP-037]**, the 1,018.7ha of agricultural land required temporarily for construction and operation constitutes 0.09% of the total farmland in the East Midlands and is unlikely to result in an impact of agricultural production. As such, the loss of non-food producing land as a result of the Proposed Development is not considered to require the need for alternative land to compensate for the loss of biomass. It should be also noted that the loss of agricultural land has also been carefully considered by the sensitive and iterative design of the Proposed Development, whereby the Proposed Development has been designed with recognition of the need to allow current farming practices to continue where possible. As a result, the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which provides allows current farming practices to continue and also offers other benefits, for example in relation to bird mitigation. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV agricultural land.

7.2 General Public: Cultural Heritage

Table 7-2: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage
RR-013, RR-028, RR-098, RR-207, RR-213, RR-227, RR-244, RR-272	Adverse Impact on Cultural Heritage	The Proposed Development will have an adverse impact on the cultural heritage of Lincolnshire and this cannot be replaced. The Applicant's apparent lack of respect for historical heritage is evident as this is being sacrificed in favour of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development will result in substantial harm to heritage assets including (but not limited to) Bassingham Conservation Area and the Lincoln Cliff villages. Conservation areas have a rich historic character, containing a significant number of listed buildings and heritage assets. The visual intrusion and industrial nature of the proposed development would compromise the setting of these heritage assets.	The Applicant does not agree with the statement that the Proposed Development lacks respect for the cultural heritage resource of the area or that it would result in substantial harm to heritage assets. On the contrary, the Proposed Development has been designed taking into account heritage constraints. The design has been informed by staged assessment work in order to remove or reduce potential impacts upon heritage assets, and reflects a proactive approach to identifying, assessing and mitigating impacts (please refer to Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially Appendix 7-B Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment **[APP-125]**, Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]**, and Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment **[APP-128]**). As a result, feasible mitigation measures were included in the design (embedded mitigation), including removal of panels from certain areas or planting to reduce visibility, ensuring no significant effects upon built heritage assets would be incurred, which is summarised within Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**. It should also be noted that the quoted "substantial harm" is unsubstantiated – this comprises a high test, measured by a degree of harm to heritage significance of an asset (as opposed to scale of development or level of change in asset's setting). The Proposed Development has been designed to ensure no substantial harm would be incurred, with the key contributors to the significance of potentially sensitive heritage assets retained. With regard to Bassingham Conservation Area specifically, this was the subject of detailed assessment within Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]** taking into account the contribution of the setting to the heritage significance of the asset and the impacts from the Proposed Development. This assessment concluded that, whilst the introduction of solar panels will constitute a change to part of the Conservation Area's setting, this change will not alter the perception, interpretation and intelligibility of the Conservation Area as a historic rural settlement in a way which would harm its special historic and architectural interest, and as such no harm was found. With regard to the Lincoln Cliff villages (i.e. Coleby or Boothby Graffoe), those are located in the proximity of the Cable Corridor and c. 4-5km from the nearest solar panels. The cable is proposed below ground and as such would not change the setting or affect the heritage significance of assets in those villages. This was confirmed through consultation with Historic England, confirming there would be no issues on designated heritage assets from construction work along the Cable Corridor and those assets were scoped out of detailed assessment (initial consideration is presented in Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]** and summary of consultations with Historic England in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**).
RR-041, RR-098	Impact of Visible Cabling / Preference for Underground Cabling	Concerns that views of pylons, cabling, and substations will undermine local heritage. Comment that to protect the rural heritage of the area, under cabling must be mandated in sensitive areas.	No pylons are proposed as part of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development was informed by a staged approach to heritage assessment (please refer to Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially Appendix 7-B Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment **[APP-125]**, Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]**, and Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment **[APP-128]**) so as to remove (or minimise as far as possible) any impacts upon the cultural heritage resource within the environs of the Order Limits. For the avoidance of any doubt, underground cabling will be implemented within the Cable Corridor.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage
RR-081	Impact on Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings	Concerns regarding Scheduled Monuments and listed buildings within proximity of the Proposed Development. One such heritage asset is Hall Close, which is a medieval and post-medieval hall complex south of Dovecote Lane, with dovecote, gardens, fishponds, churchyard and cultivation remains and is located less than 50m from to the central section of the Solar and Energy Storage Park. An example of a listed building within 3km of the Site, is the grade II listed River Farmhouse which sits within the Solar and Energy Storage Park. The infrastructure of the Proposed Development will have a detrimental impact on the local heritage.	The Applicant would like to draw attention to the Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]**, which has discussed in detail the potential effects of the Proposed Development upon the designated heritage assets, including those mentioned in this representation. The following responses are provided for the assets mentioned specifically (but reference should be made to Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]** and Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** for consideration of other assets in the area): - Regarding Hall Close Scheduled Monument, an appropriate understanding of the significance of the asset and contribution made by setting to that significance is presented in Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]** and the sensitivities associated with this asset have informed the layout of the Proposed Development (including the removal of panels from areas immediately adjacent to the Scheduled Monument). The detailed assessment concluded that the Proposed Development will not obscure or impact on the appreciation, understanding or experience of the Scheduled Monument and whilst the solar panels will introduce change to one part of the asset's surroundings, this change will in no way harm its historic, aesthetic and evidential values, or the understanding and appreciation of these values. Consequently, it was concluded that there would be no harm to the significance of this asset and Historic England in its Relevant Representation did not raise any concerns with regard to this asset. - Regarding River Farmhouse, the assessment of level of harm upon the Listed Building, taking into consideration the asset's heritage significance and its setting, the Proposed Development and mitigation measures, was presented within Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]**. This focused on aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance (Historic England guidance clarifies that not all elements of setting contribute), and the Applicant is of the opinion that the Assessment has accurately described the aspects of the setting of River Farmhouse which do contribute. Here, the Proposed Development will change part of the asset's wider setting, although the historic and architectural interest of the Listed Building itself, and the contribution to the heritage significance from the asset's immediate setting will not be affected at all. As such, whilst there will be a change within the wider setting, its overall effect on the significance of the asset will be minor as only part of the asset's setting and experience will be affected. On this basis, the conclusion within the Assessment found the overall harm to be within the lower end of less than substantial harm.
RR-041, RR-087, RR-120, RR-290	Impact on Cultural Heritage within the Cable Corridor	The Cable Corridor will pass through areas of high landscape value and as such, risks visual harm to heritage settings such as Somerton Castle which is a Scheduled Monument. The Cable Corridor also crosses areas rich in archaeological remains, including Roman and Medieval Features near the historic Fosse Way Roman Road. The potential heritage impact on these features should be a significant consideration in relation to the Cable Corridor	With regard to potential impacts upon assets in the vicinity of the Cable Corridor, including Somerton Castle, the cable is proposed below ground and as such would not change the setting or affect the heritage significance of assets in this area. This was discussed in consultation with Historic England, confirming there would be no issues on designated heritage assets from construction work along the Cable Corridor and therefore those assets were scoped out of detailed assessment (initial consideration is presented in Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment **[APP-127]** and summary of consultations with Historic England in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**). With regard to archaeology, the Cable Corridor does cross an area within which a number of archaeological remains are located (including those identified as part of the surveys completed to inform the ES – please refer to Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** for archaeological remains within the Cable Corridor), although it should be clarified that the Cable Corridor is near 'Ermine Street' Roman Road (the Fosse Way Roman Road is the modern A46, which dissects the Principal Site). The Applicant is committed to ensuring that archaeological

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage
			remains are taken into account during the detailed design process. The results of the Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**), and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. This will include the Cable Corridor. These areas have not been subject to trial trenching at this stage, as the detailed design is yet to be developed. As part of an iterative approach to the detailed design process, the locations for construction activities associated with the Cable Corridor will be fed into the design for a programme of further trial trenching work, which will in turn inform the design process and appropriate mitigation measures. The Applicant is committed to ensuring that consideration of archaeological constraints feeds into the detailed design process, with appropriate mitigation to be agreed.
RR-087, RR-120, RR-290	Insufficient Archaeological Assessments and Investigations	There is a lack of detail on archaeological watching briefs and concerns regarding the level of consultation with Historic England. The current documentation does not provide a clear methodology for pre-construction investigation, monitoring or preservation of heritage assets. Clarity is sought regarding how archaeological surveys or mitigation will be managed or monitored.	The Applicant is of the opinion that an appropriate and proportionate level of archaeological work has been carried out to inform the decision-making process. The ES Appendix 7-H Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation **[APP-131]** was subject to consultation with the archaeological advisor at LCC and was approved on 7 May 2025, prior to the evaluation commencing. Following a range of non-intrusive surveys (as detailed in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]** and relevant Appendices, especially Appendix 7-B: Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment **[APP-125]**, Appendix 7-F: Air Photo and LiDAR Mapping and Interpretation **[APP-129]**, and Appendix 7-G: Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report **[APP-130]**), the first phase of trial trenching has been completed. The Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**) will be submitted to the Examination at the next available Examination deadline. The results of the Final Trial Trenching Report, and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. This Framework WSI will be updated to reflect the Final Trial Trenching Report and submitted to the Examination at a future Examination deadline to inform the decision-making process. As such, the Applicant is of the opinion that due regard has been given to the importance of understanding the significance of archaeological remains and the potential impact of the Proposed Development, and measures to ensure appropriate and proportionate mitigation is included have been built into the design process. The Applicant will be liaising with relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA) to develop the next stage of site-specific WSIs to guide detailed design and post-consent activities, and prior to the carrying out of any archaeological works. With regard to consultations with Historic England, the details are presented within Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, and subsequent engagement is also reflected within the SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England (which will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**). The Applicant is of the opinion that the SoCG demonstrates a sufficient level of consultation.
RR-087, RR-120, RR-290	Impact of Construction Phase on Heritage Assets	The excavation activities required during the construction phase may result in the destruction of buried archaeological features resulting in permanent loss.	As clarified in ES Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage **[APP-032]**, the approach to the cultural heritage assessment was agreed through consultation with Historic England and LCC, Appendix 7-H: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation of the ES **[APP-131]** was subject to consultation with the archaeological advisor at LCC and was approved on 7 May 2025, prior to the evaluation commencing. There is an appropriate process, as detailed in national and local planning policy and guidance, which ensures that the potential archaeological remains, their significance and impacts are understood, and appropriate mitigation measures (including via recording) can be defined. The Applicant is of the opinion that the assessment work completed as part of the ES (Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, and relevant Appendices, especially Appendix 7-D Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage
			[APP-127], Appendix 7-F: Air Photo and LiDAR Mapping and Interpretation **[APP-129]**, Appendix 7-G: Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report **[APP-130]**, and Appendix 7-I: Trial Trenching Report (Interim) **[APP-132]**), the scope of which has been agreed through consultations with archaeology and heritage advisors at Historic England and LCC, is proportionate and fully compliant with the policies within NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, and the NPPF. The Applicant is committed to ensuring that archaeological remains are taken into account during the detailed design process. The Final Trial Trenching Report (which supersedes the results of Appendix 7-I Trial Trenching Report (Interim) of the ES **[APP-132]**, to be submitted to the Examination at the next available Examination deadline) will enable a detailed consideration of the relevant data as part of the decision-making process. The results of the Final Trial Trenching Report, and any additional required trenching, will inform the detailed design, which will be carried out following granting of the DCO, as detailed within the Framework WSI **[AS-001]**. This will include the Cable Corridor. These areas have not been subject to trial trenching at this stage, as detailed design is yet to be developed. As part of an iterative approach to the detailed design process, the locations for construction activities associated with the Cable Corridor will be fed into the design for a programme of further trial trenching work, which will in turn inform the detailed design process and appropriate mitigation measures. The Applicant is committed to ensuring that archaeological constraints feed into the detailed design process, with appropriate mitigation to be agreed.
RR-222	The Lancaster Bomber Statue (Nottingham / Lincolnshire Border)	The recently erected full-size Lancaster bomber statue is on the Nottingham/ Lincolnshire border close to Norton Disney. Of the large number of visitors who will visit the site, it is likely that many will explore the local area.	The location of the Lancaster bomber statue is 3.5km to the west of the solar panels within the Principal Site west of Bassingham (at the closest point; those panels to the north of the A46 are 4.7km away). Whilst this statue was not subject to detailed assessment (if indeed it could be considered a heritage asset at all, considering its recent establishment and whether it is of sufficient interest to comprise a heritage asset), it is considered that due to distance and intervening vegetation and development, the Proposed Development would not have any effect on any potential heritage significance of this statue (now or in the future). Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land use of the ES **[AS-016]** includes an assessment of potential effects on tourism/recreation arising from the Proposed Development comprising consideration of impacts on local accommodation facilities, recreational receptors and visitor attractions. Section 12.5 identifies the size of the visitor economy and recognises that the villages of Coleby, Bassingham, Navenby and Aubourn contain visitor and recreational attractions, and that there is also a network of PRoWs in the surrounding area which may be used by visitors. With due consideration given to other assessment findings set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]**, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]** and Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics (Section 14.2: Air Quality) **[APP-039]** as appropriate, the assessment in Section 12.7 concludes that overall the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism/recreation receptors is not significant during the construction/ decommissioning and operational phases.
RR-222	Cultural Heritage Study Area	In response to NKDC disagreeing with the proposed study area the Applicant ignores NKDC saying that Heritage England confirmed suitability of the approach to the Study Areas. Did HE comment first; if so, have they subsequently confirmed they disagree with NKDC? It is clear that NKDC strongly consider both designated and non-designated heritage assets should be included up to 5km from the boundary. The Applicant states that “the study areas proposed align with other solar farm schemes in Lincolnshire.” The applicant is	With regard to the study areas for the assessment, the NKDC position is to extend to a distance of 5km from the Order Limits, whilst the Applicant considered a flexible approach, utilising largely a 1km study area (for non-designated assets), 3km (for designated heritage assets), 5km (for designated assets of highest value), including assets beyond (i.e. the Grade I Listed Lincoln Cathedral), based on feedback from Historic England and subsequent consultations. It is acknowledged that there is a difference of opinion regarding suitable scope of assessment between the consultees. As clarified in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, the approach to study areas was agreed through consultation with Historic England, who approved

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cultural Heritage
		selective in following precedent from other solar farms; Springwell Solar Farm proposed 2km and 5km respectively. Areas differ in many respects; NKDC are the local authority and will have reasons for their assertion regarding the Study Areas, their request should be complied with.	of the flexible approach to setting matters at the Scoping stage, and this approach was further discussed and agreed in a meeting on 31 March 2025. This flexible approach is proportionate and focuses on assets that are likely to be affected (as opposed to providing detail on vast numbers of assets only to scope them out at an early stage). As such, it is considered that the approach to the assessment is proportional to the potential impacts from the Proposed Development.
RR-227	Mitigation	Heritage and Historic Rural landscape: The area includes medieval field systems, historic hedgerows, and heritage assets such as Hall Close Scheduled Monument and the Old Church at Aubourn whose setting depends on open countryside. The proposed solar and BESS infrastructure could industrialise a landscape of significant historic character. Request: Assurance that important hedgerows and field boundaries will be retained, and that archaeological evaluation across the whole site is thorough before any disturbance	The historic landscape aspects are considered within Appendix 7-E Historic Landscape Character Assessment of the ES **[APP-128]** (with the detailed assessment of the potential effects upon heritage assets presented within Appendix 7-D: Detailed Heritage Asset Setting Assessment of the ES **[APP-127]**) and the Applicant is of the opinion that a proportionate level of assessment with regard to historic landscape (and its contribution to the significance of heritage assets) was undertaken taking into account the overall significance and impacts from the Proposed Development. This assessment identified that some of the field boundaries within the Order Limits qualify as 'important' hedgerows under the archaeology and history criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. Of these, there are several areas of surviving interconnected field boundaries (and further isolated or truncated important hedgerows). The Proposed Development would be contained within the existing field boundaries (with the exception of localised removal to facilitate circulation and access where required) and would therefore have no impact on the historical integrity of historically important hedgerows of the Order Limits. As stated in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. CH-C2), the Proposed Development will seek to retain any hedgerows deemed 'important' under the archaeology and history criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. With regard to any localised removal of Important Historic Hedgerows (as per the Hedgerow Plan **[AS-013]** and Appendix 7-E **[APP-128]**) to facilitate construction, where hedge removal is required for visibility splays only, where practical they will be trimmed down to a height to be agreed with County Highways, most likely 0.9m, so that it is not removed altogether and can regrow after construction. Production of a detailed CEMP, which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, will be secured under Requirements 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. In summary, taking into account the potential effects of the Proposed Development and mitigation to be implemented, it can be concluded that the Proposed Development would not lead to significant effects upon the historic landscape, including 'important' hedgerows, as established in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**.

7.3 General Public: Ecology and Nature Conservation

Table 7-3: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation
RR-004, RR-006, RR-007, RR-009, RR-018, RR-021, RR-022, RR-030, RR-036, RR-041, RR-045, RR-047, RR-052, RR-053, RR-054, RR-070, RR-081, RR-086, RR-087, RR-090, RR-093, RR-100, RR-103, RR-111, RR-119, RR-120, RR-128, RR-130, RR-139, RR-141, RR-143, RR-145, RR-151, RR-154, RR-160, RR-161, RR-162, RR-171, RR-173, RR-175, RR-176, RR-182, RR-183, RR-192, RR-198, RR-203, RR-207, RR-208, RR-217, RR-226, RR-227, RR-229, RR-231, RR-238, RR-249, RR-252, RR-257, RR-262, RR-265, RR-268, RR-269, RR-273, RR-279, RR-284, RR-286, RR-290, RR-291	Impact on Wildlife Habitats	Concerns regarding potential disruption, loss, fragmentation and displacement of local wildlife habitats having a detrimental impact on wildlife. Particular concerns have been raised regarding potential disturbance to breeding and feeding habitats, hedgerows, nesting areas, foraging grounds and field margins and the restriction of movement of wildlife.	It should be noted that the assessment presented in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** identified no significant adverse effects upon ecological receptors as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Significant beneficial effects will be established during operation upon a variety of habitat types (including woodland, grassland and hedgerows), for example new hedgerow planting and bolstering of existing defunct hedgerows will increase connectivity across the Order Limits for species such as bats. Additional grassland and conservation margins provided adjacent to and beneath the solar PV panels in the Principal Site, and larger permanent grassland fields, including in arable field margin in retained arable fields, will increase the diversity of flora in comparison to existing intensive agriculture and provide new habitat niches to encourage fauna such as invertebrates and birds. Habitats such as woodland and hedgerows within, and surrounding, the Order Limits will be protected and buffered, wherever practicable, by a minimum of 15m from the Proposed Development. The buffer zones will be in accordance with British Standard Recommendations BS 5837:2012, as stated in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. These buffer zones will not only ensure protection, but in combination with the habitat creation proposed in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, will allow regeneration / expansion of the woodland edges and hedgerows to provide additional habitat and linkages around the area. The development of a detailed CEMP and a detailed LEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plans, is secured via Requirement 12 and Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. Requirement 12 and 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** includes LCC and the Environment Agency (amongst other statutory bodies) as prescribed consultees in respect of the final CEMP and LEMP. Habitat such as hedges and woodland used for nesting by birds will be retained and appropriately buffered to avoid disturbance. New habitat created as part of the Proposed Development, stated in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, (such as grassland within and surrounding the solar panels, large open species rich grassland, new tree and hedge planting) will provide additional foraging resources. The mitigation provision for ground-nesting birds consists of 64ha (158.1 acres) of permanent grassland and a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable. These areas are indicatively illustrated as Arable fields A to F on Figure 8-5: Bird Mitigation Land Allocation (Revision 2) of the ES **[AS-046]** but could be rotated within the areas of the Order Limits where there is no solar PV infrastructure, providing the principles for field sizes are achieved. The mitigation is secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. Regarding the restriction of movement of wildlife, in addition to the 16km of hedgerow planting within the Order Limits, all security perimeter fencing will include gaps to allow mammals to pass underneath at strategic locations to maintain ecological connectivity with the surrounding area. The final locations of these mammal passes will be determined following pre-commencement surveys. The additional 16km of hedgerows (including the gapping up of existing fragmented hedgerows) will provide new or improved commuting routes and foraging grounds for a range of faunal species within the Order Limits.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation
			A wide range of other enhancements for wildlife are proposed in the Framework LEM) **[AS-122]**, including the provision of habitat boxes (e.g. nest boxes, bat boxes), hibernacula for reptiles and amphibians and a programme of pond restoration.
RR-021, RR-022, RR-028, RR-040, RR-085, RR-087, RR-093, RR-120, RR-139, RR-160, RR-161, RR-173, RR-174, RR-184, RR-185, RR-222, RR-226, RR-227, RR-243, RR-249, RR-250, RR-253, RR-254, RR-263, RR-287, RR-289, RR-290	Impact on Wildlife Species	Concerns for protected species and other wildlife with specific references including (but not limited to) deer, owls, red-kites, sparrow hawks, bats, badgers, great crested newts, otters, nesting birds and badgers. There have also been references to the displacement of native plants. Concerns regarding microclimates caused by panel shading.	The assessment presented in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** identified no significant adverse effects upon ecological receptors (including deer, owls, red-kites, sparrow hawks, bats, badgers, great crested newts, otters, nesting birds and badgers) as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Mitigation has been developed as part of the design of the Proposed Development to ensure impacts on protected species and other flora and fauna are minimised. For example, as set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, all security perimeter fencing will include gaps to allow these mammals to pass underneath at strategic locations to maintain ecological connectivity. The final locations of these mammal passes will be determined following pre-commencement surveys. The development of a detailed CEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** includes the Environment Agency as prescribed consultee in respect of the final CEMP. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid badger setts, as set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and will adhere to best practice measures to minimise impacts on badgers. In addition to these best practice measures, pre-commencement checks will be carried out, and measures will be implemented to avoid animals being injured or killed within construction areas. In the event that a badger sett is identified within the works area and impacts cannot be avoided, the appropriate licensing process will be followed. Habitat used by breeding birds of prey including owls, sparrowhawks and red-kites will be retained and appropriately buffered to avoid disturbance. New habitat created (such as grassland, species rich meadows, new tree planting) as part of the Proposed Development will provide additional foraging resources for these species. No impacts to riparian mammals or great crested newts were identified (see Appendix 8-J: Riparian Mammals **[APP-142]** and Appendix 8-E: Great Crested Newt **[APP-137]**). Water vole burrows were identified along the River Witham and will be avoided and buffered from the Proposed Development, as set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Regarding the displacement of native plants, as shown in Figure 8-4 Habitat Map of the ES **[AS-045]**, the vast majority of the Order Limits comprises arable land, in the form of cereal crops, these provide very little ecological value, with the exception of three fields: AF17, AF29 and AF72 (see Figure 8-B-1 Hedgerow and notable flora of the ES **[AS-080]**) that support scarce arable flora of county to national importance. As set out in paragraph 5.3.88 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, the field margins will be managed to provide conditions to encourage scarce arable flora, and other arable fields will continue to provide suitable habitat for scarce arable flora. Other high value habitats such as hedgerows and woodland will be retained and buffered wherever possible, with new habitat provided including 16km of new native hedgerows planted to off-set any minor losses of hedges and provide enhancement.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation
			It is acknowledged that there will be changes in the microclimates caused by panel shading and through the provision of new grassland in and around the solar panels that will replace the dominant arable habitat. By establishing a diverse sward of grasses and herbs of modified grassland, biodiversity will increase compared to the arable baseline, enhancing value for wildlife beneath and around the PV panels. Monitoring of the grassland will be carried out to assess the impacts of changes to the microclimate, as well as the monitoring of shading and grazing responses (as relevant), with findings fed back into the long-term management of the Order Limits.
RR-048, RR-139, RR-263, RR-287	Whisby Nature Reserve	Concerns regarding the impact on the Whisby Nature Reserve which some respondents believe to be an SSSI designated location. Request that if this is correct, the Applicant should confirm that any relevant modelling or assumptions will fully comply with all the requirements of an SSSI.	Whisby Nature Reserve is classified as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR), not a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). As stated in Table 8-14 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**, due to the embedded mitigation secured within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (such as pollution control and dust suppression), there is expected to be no impact pathways, either directly or indirectly, that would impact upon the integrity or functioning of Whisby Nature Park LNR. The integration of soft landscaping within the design of the Proposed Development includes measures to increase connectivity across the Order Limits and in the wider ecological network, noting the opportunities to form ecological connections to Whisby LNR. The provision of a detailed CEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-028, RR-087, RR-090, RR-120, RR-175, RR-176, RR-183, RR-290	Proposed Mitigation	Questions regarding the Applicant's approach to mitigation for any loss of wildlife habitats. Comments have also been made regarding the Applicant's proposed approach to biodiversity in relation to decommissioning.	As set out in Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]** (ref. paragraph 5.6.3), the design of the Proposed Development adopted a standard hierarchical approach to identifying mitigation measure requirements, first seeking to avoid or prevent effects (for example through design, such as buffers from woodland habitats), then to reduce the level if the effect is unavoidable, and finally to offset if the effect can neither be avoided nor reduced. Table 8-15 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** presents an assessment of potential effects arising from the Proposed Development upon relevant ecological features (IEFs), which includes consideration of the potential loss of wildlife habitats. The table sets out the relevant mitigation that is secured by the framework management plans submitted with the DCO Application, such as the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** and Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, which provide a description of the mitigation measures proposed for the Proposed Development. The provision of a detailed LEMP and a detailed CEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plans, is secured via Requirement 8 and Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. The assessment in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** concludes that with the mitigation measures in place (as set out in Table 8-15), there will be no significant adverse effects upon habitats and species. Significant beneficial effects will be established during the operational phase of the Proposed Development upon a variety of habitat types (including woodland, grassland and hedgerows), for example where new hedgerow planting and bolstering of existing defunct hedgerows which will increase connectivity across the Order Limits for species such as bats. It should be noted that, alongside the habitat creation and enhancement measures set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** such as grassland creation, native tree and hedge planting, the Applicant has also made a commitment to deliver a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA's) Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4) for the Proposed Development. Refer to the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** for further details. Note there is currently no target Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) based on national or local policy for NSIPs, instead the requirement

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation
			is for the achievement of no-net-loss (≥0% BNG). This commitment will be legally secured through Requirement 8(2) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regards to the proposed approach to biodiversity at decommissioning, as set out in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 1.1.5), post decommissioning, the landowner is expected to return the land to its current use. It is anticipated that some areas of habitat and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement may be left in-situ for species protection; for example, planted hedges, trees and woodlands would not be removed except where needed for access or if a landowner requires this. The provision of a detailed DEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-007, RR-174, RR-183, RR-265	Approach to Biodiversity Net Gain	Concerns regarding the Applicant's approach to BNG – requests for this to be independently verified and legally secured.	The Applicant notes the request for the Applicant's approach to biodiversity net gain (BNG) to be independently verified. The BNG assessment has been undertaken by suitably qualified ecologists, following the relevant guidance and methodology, using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4), as set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]**. It should be noted that the Applicant's commitment regarding BNG will be legally secured through Requirement 8(2) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-222	Otters	The Applicant states "Therefore, in consideration of the limited number of records of Otter (restricted to the River Witham and River Brant), the DCO Site is of value to a population of Otter at a local level." Given that otters are species of principal importance for conservation in England, on what basis does the Applicant consider otters within the DCO Site to be of value at a local level and not a National level?	The presence of a Species of Principal Importance at a site does not automatically mean that the particular site is of national value for that species. The assessment methodology is based on a suite of national guidance for Ecological Impact Assessment, as set out in paragraph 8.2.11 of Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]**. The limited evidence of Otter present within the Order Limits, and the fact that Otter populations are rising in Lincolnshire, suggest it is of local importance only, as stated in Appendix 8-J Riparian Mammals of the ES **[APP-142]**. That is to say, if the site was removed, the Otter population would be impacted at a local level only, not a national level. Following the assessment shown in Appendix 8-J Riparian Mammals of the ES **[APP-142]**, the Proposed Development will embed sufficient avoidance and mitigation measures, as set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, a detailed version of which will be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** , to ensure that any Otter occurring within the Order Limits are not negatively impacted upon, in line with all relevant legislation, policy and guidance. Such measures include (ref. ECO-C8 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**) the implementation of undeveloped areas of a minimum of 10m from the bank-top of watercourses (extended to a minimum of 100m from the River Witham where the Cable Corridor is proposed) to protect riparian habitats, some of which (such as the River Witham) support Otter. These buffers and undeveloped zones will provide mitigation for potential hazards such as chemical and soils spills into watercourses and avoid potential direct impacts to watercourses and any protected species using them. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** goes on to explain (ref. ECO-C8) that pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to support the baseline survey findings where intrusive crossing methods of watercourses are proposed within the Order Limits. The purpose of these pre-construction surveys is to ensure mitigation during the construction phase is based on the latest protected species information. Where there have been any changes to Otter distribution within the Order Limits (or the status of the potential Otter holt), mitigation measures (such as non-intrusive crossing for cabling) will be updated accordingly and the relevant Natural England protected species licence application would be applied for if disturbance to breeding Otter was unavoidable.
RR-092, RR-182, RR-227	Arboriculture / Hedgerows	Concerned about the impact on mature hedgerows and ancient woodland, as well as the trees adjoining Tunman and Housham	Tunman Wood, Housham Woods and all Ancient Woodland within and surrounding the Order Limits will be protected and buffered by a minimum of 15m from the Proposed Development with

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation
		Woods. Request to retain all existing hedgerows and trees including at the site of the BESS. The destruction of hedgerows and coppicing trees will impact on wildlife, causing the loss of breeding and feeding habitats, which will cause a decline in wildlife, due to vegetation removal impacting the food chain for all wildlife.	the buffer zones in accordance with British Standard Recommendations BS 5837:2012[22], as stated in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. These buffer zones will not only ensure protection but allow regeneration of the woodland edge to provide additional habitat and linkages from the wood. The Proposed Development will seek to retain any hedgerows which are 'important' under the criteria set out in Regulation 4 of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 where possible, as stated in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ECO-C3). A detailed CEMP will be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. As shown on Figure 3-17 Maximum Vegetation Removal Plan (Rev 1) of the ES **[AS-029]**, with regards to the site of the centralised BESS, two small sections of hedgerow will be lost to provide access for the BESS. To offset any losses in hedgerows and provide an increase in biodiversity value with respect to the hedgerows in the Order Limits, the proposed planting design shown in the Landscape Mitigation Plan presented in Figure 7.15-1 within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** includes a total of 16km of native hedgerow, which includes gapping up of fragmented hedges to improve habitat connectivity. As stated in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[APP-194]** the Applicant has committed to deliver a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) (Version 1.0.4) for the Proposed Development. This will be legally secured through Requirement 8(2) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It should be noted that the assessment presented in Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** identified no significant adverse effects upon ecological receptors (including the loss of habitats that support breeding and feeding) as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Significant beneficial effects were established during operation upon a variety of habitat types (including woodland, grassland and hedgerows), for example where new hedgerow planting and bolstering of existing defunct hedgerows which will increase connectivity across the Order Limits for species such as bats.

[22] British Standards Institution (2012) British Standard Recommendations BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations.

7.4 General Public: Landscape and Visual Amenity

Table 7-4: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity
RR-001, RR-002, RR-007, RR-008, RR-009, RR-010, RR-011, RR-012, RR-013, RR-015, RR-016, RR-017, RR-018, RR-020, RR-021, RR-023, RR-026, RR-027, RR-028, RR-029, RR-034, RR-040, RR-041 RR-042, RR-044, RR-048, RR-050, RR-055, RR-069, RR-074, RR-075, RR-081, RR-083, RR-085, RR-086, RR-087, RR-090, RR-092, RR-093, RR-094, RR-096, RR-098, RR-100, RR-103, RR-106, RR-108, RR-111, RR-113, RR-119, RR-120, RR-123, RR-124, RR-128, RR-129, RR-132, RR-134, RR-135, RR-139, RR-141, RR-144, RR-145, RR-146, RR-148, RR-151, RR-152, RR-155, RR-160, RR-161, RR-166, RR-170, RR-171, RR-173, RR-174, RR-175, RR-176, RR-177, RR-183, RR-184, RR-185, RR-188, RR-189, RR-191, RR-192, RR-194, RR-195, RR-196, RR-198, RR-206, RR-208, RR-209, RR-213, RR-216, RR-218, RR-222, RR-223, RR-225, RR-226, RR-227, RR-228, RR-229, RR-230, RR-231, RR-241, RR-244, RR-245 RR-247, RR-249, RR-250, RR-252, RR-254, RR-257, RR-259, RR-262, RR-263, RR-265, RR-267, RR-268, RR-269, RR-270, RR-272, RR-273, RR-276, RR-279, RR-281, RR-284, RR-289, RR-290	Visual Impact of the Proposed Development	Concern regarding the visual impact of the Proposed Development and the industrialisation of the countryside of the surrounding areas ruining the current rural views. Questions have been raised as to whether an LVIA has been carried out. Respondents consider screening to be insufficient and are concerned about being subject to unwanted views of solar panels, pylons, cabling and substations.	The Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development, as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse effects on the landscape character and visual amenity resulting from the Proposed Development, as detailed within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, but considers that these would predominantly be in the short to medium term during construction and the early years of operation of the Proposed Development. There are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on residents of local villages as, by year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping (see the Landscape Mitigation Plan provided in Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) would have matured such that views of solar PV infrastructure within the Order Limits would be screened. Photomontages (see ES Figure 10-10 Photomontages **[APP-097, AS-119]**) have been prepared to inform the visual assessment undertaken in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** - these photomontages demonstrate how the visual impact at relevant receptors reduces over time as the proposed landscaping matures. The Applicant has committed to a minimum offset of 50m of all solar infrastructure, 200m from the centralised BESS infrastructure and 150m from the distributed BESS infrastructure from all residential properties to minimise impacts to their visual amenity. These commitments are set out in the Design Commitments within the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** and the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The detailed design of the Proposed Development must be in accordance with the Design Commitments, as secured by Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. While the Proposed Development comprises infrastructure for solar energy generation and associated development (such as BESS), the land is not permanently changed to industrial use in land use planning terms, and it should be noted that the Proposed Development also includes a significant amount of retained arable land. It should also be noted that the Proposed Development comprises a temporary installation and at end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, the infrastructure will be removed, and the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, a detailed version of which will be developed, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. Following decommissioning, the land will be returned to the landowners and available for its current use, although it will be the decision of the landowners as to how they use and manage the land. Section 7 of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.11) secures the need to monitor and review the management prescriptions undertaken to ensure they are still sufficient. This includes for walkover surveys of the Order Limits to be undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. A detailed LEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan will be developed post-consent, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity
RR-007, RR-151, RR-194, RR-208	Visual Impact of Security Measures	Concerns that security measures such as CCTV and security lighting would be visually intrusive and oppressive.	The extent of CCTV and security lighting within the Order Limits would be controlled by the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]**, Design Commitments set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, and Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which secures that the detailed design of the Proposed Development will be in accordance with the Design Commitments and the Proposed Development Parameters. Security lighting would be limited to the temporary construction (and decommissioning) compounds and laydown areas which would be removed at the end of the construction phase. Task-specific lighting would be required for cable laying works but would also be removed once construction is completed. Internal facing CCTV would be deployed on poles up to 3.5m in height around the perimeter of the Order Limits but would not require additional lighting. The visual impacts of CCTV and security lighting have been considered as part of the wider proposals within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. Furthermore, as secured within the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. LV-O3), the proposed operational lighting and CCTV has been designed to avoid adverse effects and minimise visual intrusion. The following mitigation has been embedded within the Proposed Development: • No areas of the Proposed Development will be continuously lit. • Operational lighting will be triggered by Passive Infra-red Detector (PID) systems, which will be installed around the perimeter of the Proposed Development. • Lighting will be directional with care to minimise potential for light spillage beyond the DCO Site particularly towards neighbouring properties, habitats, highways or waterways. • Lights installed will be of the minimum brightness and/or power rating capable of performing the desired function. • Light fittings will be used to reduce the amount of light emitted above the horizontal (reduce upward lighting). • The lighting of the primary substation will be motion sensor triggered, that would operate from dusk. • Low level lighting on specific operational units will be triggered by motion sensors, from dusk. • The inward facing CCTV cameras will typically use night-vision technology and will not require additional lighting. The provision of a detailed OEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-028	Ineffective Assessment	The Applicant has understated the visual and landscape impacts of the proposed development on the Limestone Heath. Even after the mitigation planting has matured, the impact of the 15m high transformers of the Navenby substation and other BESS infrastructure all clustered in this area will still be visible and permanently change the character of the area.	The Applicant has considered the visual and landscape impacts of the Proposed Development, both in isolation and in-combination with other relevant cumulative schemes, such as the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby, on Limestone Heath (with regards to Local Landscape Character Area (LLCA) 16: Limestone Heath and Landscape Character Type (LCT) Central Plateau and sub-area 7: Limestone Heath) in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. It should be noted that landscape and visual impacts to Limestone Heath would be limited to the construction phase of the Proposed Development, whereby any perception of the Principal Site (including the BESS infrastructure forming part of the Proposed Development) would be negated by the distance and intervening features, so as not to alter the character of Limestone Heath. Construction impacts include excavation of landform to implement the below ground cable, along with construction compounds and access, with specific

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity
			equipment including horizontal direction drilling to cross watercourses, as well as localised alteration to landform. These construction phase impacts are assessed as short term and reversible with a minor adverse (not significant) impact in winter. This impact is inherent of the nature of the construction works to be undertaken, and as such mitigation proposed (such as the protection of retained vegetation, as noted in LV-C1 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**) would not reduce this effect. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Cumulative effects and interactions between the Proposed Development and other relevant cumulative schemes (including the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby (ID 105) and other proposed BESS schemes (e.g. Brant Energy Storage Scheme, ID 108)) are assessed in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** and summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** With regards to the cumulative assessment of the Proposed Development in-combination with the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby (ID 105), as set out in paragraph 10.10.28 of in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, given the scale of the cumulative site relative to the Order Limits and the fact the Cumulative Development is encompassed by the Order Limits of the Proposed Development, it is considered that at construction and operation (year 15) there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development in addition with Cumulative Development ID 105. This conclusion is also relevant for the Proposed Development in-combination with the other local BESS schemes (e.g. ID 86, 101 and 108). It should be noted that given that a full Planning Application and sufficient environmental information is not yet available for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby, a full cumulative effects assessment cannot be undertaken for this scheme at this time. However, in line with the EIA Screening Opinion (24/1080/EIASCR) an environmental impact assessment will be required as part of the planning application for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby, which will itself be required to consider the cumulative impacts of other applications in the vicinity, including the Proposed Development. Engagement between the Applicant for the Proposed Development and the applicants for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby has been undertaken and will continue as the project progresses.
RR-048	No Mitigation for Thorpe on the Hill	As identified in the Environmental Assessment, the impact on visual amenity for residents of Thorpe on the Hill will not be mitigated over time, due to the village being on a hill.	Changes to the design have been made in the vicinity of Thorpe on the Hill in response to feedback received from Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council and local residents during statutory consultation to reduce the impact of the Proposed Development, as set out in Table 4-2 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**. This has included the removal of solar PV within the field south-east of Thorpe on the Hill, which is now an area of managed arable fields for bird mitigation habitat purposes (i.e. no solar infrastructure proposed), to increase the distance from the village to the Proposed Development itself, and providing additional vegetation screening along Fosse Lane. As such, the Proposed Development design provides a 300m buffer between the proposed solar infrastructure and residential receptors in Thorpe on the Hill, which is secured via the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, in that under Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, the detailed design of the Proposed Development must be in accordance with the Works Plans. See Figure 3-2A of the ES **[AS-022]** and the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** for details. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** provides further details of all the design changes made in response to responses made to non-statutory and statutory consultation, the outcomes of environmental assessment and national and local planning policy.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity
			Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** concludes that the Proposed Development will have a moderate adverse (significant) impact during construction (in winter), reducing to a minor adverse (not significant) impact by Year 1 of operation (in winter), a minor adverse (not significant) impact by Year 15 of operation (in winter) and a negligible adverse (not significant) impact by Year 15 of operation (in summer) on the residents of Thorpe on the Hill.
RR-028, RR-218, RR-267, RR-268, RR-275	Ineffective Mitigation	Visual screening via planting may take years to mature, offering little immediate mitigation for residents or walkers along public rights of way. Maximum screening should be the first priority, to allow planting to fully establish before the construction commences, and maintenance of such screening is essential.	The provision of visual screening for residents and users of PRoW has been considered throughout the design of the landscaping proposals, as illustrated in the Landscape Mitigation Plan presented in Figure 7.15-1 within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, whereby (as noted in paragraph 4.1.4) the overall goal of the landscape strategy is to integrate the Proposed Development into its surrounding landscape and to avoid or minimise adverse landscape and visual effects as much as possible. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraphs 4.1.8 – 4.1.13), all solar PV panels and associated infrastructure have been sited within the existing field pattern, protecting existing vegetation, and maximising the natural screening provided by field boundary vegetation which will be supplemented with additional planting. The solar PV panels and associated infrastructure have been sited to preserve, as far as possible, cross valley views from Thorpe-on-the-Hill and important views towards Lincoln Cathedral from Tunman Hill. Larger infrastructure, such as the Onsite Substation and BESS Compound, have been located within areas of enclosed landscape, bound by frequent small woodlands and hedgerows, to minimise potential visual effects. Offsets (typically measuring in excess of 100m) from settlement boundaries and new planting have been incorporated to retain a sense of openness whilst screening the solar PV arrays from surrounding settlements. The Principal Site mostly avoids land adjacent to the local road network to minimise the visual impact on people travelling. Where this has not been possible, bespoke offsets (measuring a minimum of 20m) and mitigation planting have been incorporated. The siting of solar PV panels and associated infrastructure seeks to minimise instances of development on both sides of PRoW. Where components of the Proposed Development are proposed adjacent to a PRoW, an offset of a minimum of 10m from the centre line has been incorporated, as per the Design Commitments set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. Where components of the Proposed Development are proposed on both sides of a PRoW, these minimum commitments still apply (i.e. the provision of a minimum of 10m from the centre line either side of the PRoW), although sections of wider offsets have also been integrated to vary the extent of views experienced across the Principal Site where practicable. New and enhanced hedgerows have also been proposed to provide screening where appropriate. The detailed design of the Proposed Development must be in accordance with the Design Commitments, as secured by Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. As secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** the existing hedgerows will be managed at a minimum height of 3m (ref. Paragraph 5.2.10), whilst proposed hedgerows will be planted and managed between 3-4m (ref. paragraph 5.3.14) for the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. ID GG-C1) also notes that "*Native hedgerows will be planted/infilled and maintained to deliver a minimum height at least the same as the upper edge of the panels, which is currently proposed to be 3.5m*". These heights are sufficient to avoid a line of sight from the modelled receptors to the maximum upper edge of the proposed panels, which is 3.5m. New planting will be planted as part of the construction phase. In the unlikely event that screening planting fails, it will be replaced with like-for-like stock to ensure it performs as

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Landscape and Visual Amenity
			intended (and assessed). Refer to Paragraphs 5.3.15 and 5.3.23(g) of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**. As secured by the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, maintenance measures will be specified and implemented as part of the detailed LEMP, including (ref. paragraph 7.1.7) a post-construction monitoring programme (which will be formalised, agreed and included within the detailed LEMP) comprising walkover surveys of the Order Limits undertaken between April and June in years 2, 4, 6, 10 and then every 5 years post-construction until year 60. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.11) results from the post-construction monitoring will feed into the management plan and, if required, management may be amended accordingly based on this monitoring; for example, replacement planting and/or changes to planting species where planting has failed to establish. The provision of a detailed LEMP and a detailed CEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plans, is secured via Requirement 8 and Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively.
RR-227	Ineffective Mitigation	The Proposed Development would permanently alter the open rural landscape and views from the Lincoln Cliff villages and public footpaths would not be fully mitigated, even after 15 years. There would be significant visual effects on Grange Cottage and surrounding roads in the first year of operation. Despite new planting, the substation and BESS compounds would remain visible for many years, particularly impacting the view from Bassingham Churchyard and Holmes Wood across the River Witham.	Residents of the Lincoln Cliff villages of Coleby, Boothby Graffoe, and Navenby are considered in the Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The assessment of visual effects concludes that there will be no significant operational visual effects on the residents of the assessed Lincoln Cliff villages. Table 10-12 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** provides the following summary: "*Views across the Cable Corridor will remain unchanged in comparison to the existing views. The cable will be buried underground and will not affect the views to the north and east. Changes in views across the Principal Site will be barely perceptible due to the distance and intervening vegetation. There will be change in colour resulting from the distribution of the PV arrays across the fields. The onsite substation is going to be screened by the scattered woodland across Malborough Fen and Aubourn Fen.*" As reported in the updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 10 of the ES **[AS-117]**), the removal of solar PV in Field 46 adjoining Grange Cottage, and the amendment of proposed landscaping (as set out in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) results in the assessment of visual effects at this property reducing from Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects in Years 1 and 15 (Winter) of operation, and Minor Adverse (Not Significant) in Summer Year 15, to Minor Adverse (Not Significant) at Year 1 Winter, and Negligible Adverse at Year 15 Winter and Summer. An assessment of the visual effects of the Proposed Development from Bassingham is included in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** and concludes that there will be no significant operational visual effects. Table 10-12 of Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** provides the following summary: "*The foreground of the view will be unchanged. There will be medium distance, glimpsed views of the Proposed Development, which will include fencing, solar PV arrays and Solar Stations, available at the gaps in intervening vegetation within the back gardens and along the River Witham. The exposure to the view will be low and will affect the residents on the western edge of Bassingham. The view will comprise the Proposed Development across the closest fields. Views west of Clay Lane will be limited due to the flat topography and will be heavily filtered by the hedgerow along the road.*"

7.5 General Public: Noise and Vibration

Table 7-5: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration
RR-002, RR-007, RR-013, RR-036, RR-041, RR-053, RR-065, RR-080, RR-087, RR-090, RR-092, RR-098, RR-106, RR-120, RR-139, RR-161, RR-162, RR-183, RR-222, RR-226, RR-249, RR-250, RR-263, RR-267, RR-287, RR-290	Impact of Noise & Vibration on Local Area (Construction Phase)	Concerns that there will be significant noise pollution and vibration during the construction phase of the Proposed Development from machinery and site traffic, creating continuous background noise. There are concerns regarding whether the assessments carried out by the Applicant in relation to the impacts of noise and vibration impacts are sufficiently thorough.	The assessment of noise and vibration, presented in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**, includes a series of robust, reasonable worst-case assumptions, such as driven piling and moderate downwind conditions. In particular, construction noise levels have been predicted under the assumption that all construction activity would be occurring simultaneously when in practice, given the size of the Proposed Development, activities in any given location will only occur for a fraction of the full construction schedule. As summarised in Chapter 16: Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**, the Proposed Development will not result in significant residual adverse effects with regards to noise (including noise from machinery and construction traffic) during construction, operation or decommissioning. Regarding noise associated with site traffic, changes in road traffic noise due to construction traffic are identified as, at worst, minor and not significant (see paragraph 11.7.31 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**). Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Proposed Development to minimise noise impacts at existing receptors, as detailed in Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. Management of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) on the highway network will be managed through the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** - the provision of a detailed CTMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Appropriate routing of construction and decommissioning traffic on public roads and along access tracks will be pursuant to the detailed CTMP. With regards to vibration, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** establishes that there is the potential for significant moderate adverse vibration effects on three sensitive receptors due to vibration from noise generating construction works if driven piling is undertaken at a distance of 60 m or closer to these properties, associated with construction of the BESS, Solar Stations, and ground mounted solar PV panel arrays, based on worst-case parameters. This is considered to be a precautionary approach to construction vibration and likely to over-estimate vibration levels. If driven piling is to be undertaken, a commitment is included in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to undertake a construction vibration risk assessment such that significant effects would be avoided. If it is unavoidable that the relevant levels would be exceeded, the risk assessment would focus on limiting the exposure of nearby receptors to levels of vibration exceeding the relevant thresholds as far as reasonably practicable. Furthermore, the timing of any driven piling within 60m to residential receptors will be delayed until after 10am to avoid more sensitive time periods. Again, these significant effects would only occur for the short-term duration during which the driven piling works (if undertaken) are happening near to these residences. Management and mitigation measures have been included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to minimise these impacts as far as practical. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Table 3.7 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** commits to a construction noise monitoring plan to help ensure that the predicted levels are not exceeded in practice. The Framework CEMP also contains measures to ensure residents are not impacted by significant levels of vibration.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration
RR-006, RR-007, RR-036, RR-087, RR-090, RR-106, RR-139, RR-155, RR-161, RR-162, RR-183, RR-213, RR-222, RR-249, RR-263, RR-287	Impact of Noise & Vibration on Local Area (Operational Phase)	Concerns that once operational, inverters and cooling systems may produce a low-frequency hum. Questions as to how thorough noise test modelling has been (i.e. has this been carried out in the most onerous conditions – hottest summer temperatures). There are concerns that not enough is known about any potential effects of constant noise from such developments. Operational noise concerns are amplified due to the Proposed Development being located "downwind of prevailing south-westerly winds" which will "amplify and carry operational noise". Has the Applicant given consideration to this and incorporated such wind effects into the relevant assessments?	The operational noise results, presented in Table 11-19 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**, are based upon calculations performed under a series of reasonably worst-case assumptions, such as the wind blowing from the source to the receiver and 100% operational load for the inverter cooling fans. While it is true that substation transformers can produce a low-frequency hum, this noise would be at the limits of perceptibility at the closest properties to the substation and would not be intrusive. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. measure NV-01) commits to the final design of the Proposed Development avoiding significant effects by both meeting the levels presented in Table 11-19 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** and mitigating low-frequency noise should it occur; modelling will be undertaken at the detailed design phase to confirm the noise levels at sensitive receptors will not exceed these thresholds. The provision of a detailed OEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 13 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The adverse effect levels defined in Section 11.4 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** are based on Government policy for noise, which in turn relates to World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines[23] on community exposure response, for which there is a considerable research and evidence base.
RR-028	Noise Impact on St. Michael and All Angels Church, Bassingham	The Applicant acknowledges that construction noise levels are on the threshold for significance inside the church. However, the assessment has failed to consider the impact of this level of noise within the churchyard which would cause significant harm.	The reported construction noise levels at St. Michael and All Angels Church, Bassingham would only occur during the piling activities required for the closest solar PV mounting structures and therefore noise would only be at such a level for a short window within the wider construction programme. As such, it should be possible to avoid periods when the churchyard is particularly sensitive to noise, through proper liaison and consultation. This is committed to in Table 3.7 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-028, RR-053, RR-085, RR-087	Impact of Noise & Vibration on Wildlife	Concerns regarding the impact of noise and vibration on wildlife in the area, during the construction phase. Respondents also have concerns about the impact of constant noise on wildlife throughout the operation of the Proposed Development.	The potential for impact of Noise and Vibration on wildlife is assessed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** with no significant adverse effects identified during construction, operation or decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
RR-028, RR-222, RR-249	Impact of Noise on PRoW Users	The Applicant dismisses significant adverse effects (impacts to health arising from noise and vibration) during construction and decommissioning due to them being temporary. Additionally, the Applicant has not considered the impact of any noise arising from the Proposed Development on users of PRoWs. Although many PRoW are linear in nature, they often join with other PRoW to form circular routes and whilst the users are “transient” (as they are passing along the PRoW), their use and enjoyment of the PRoW will be destroyed along the route of the walks. This is a concern not only during the construction phase, but also throughout operational activities associated with the Proposed Development. The Applicant has failed to consider the WHO Guidelines for Community Noise.	The assessment of construction noise and vibration, as reported in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**, does not dismiss the possibility of significant adverse effects from construction and decommissioning activity due to their temporary nature. Levels above which significant adverse effects from construction/decommissioning noise and vibration would occur are provided in Table 11-7 and Table 11-8 respectively. It is merely the case that the mitigation measures committed to in Table 3.7 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** and Table 3.7 of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** are designed to ensure such levels are not exceeded. The provision of a detailed CEMP and detailed DEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the respective frameworks, is secured via Requirement 12 and 20 (respectively) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. While it is acknowledged that there will be an increased level of noise on certain PRoWs during the construction period, levels such as those presented in Table 11-14 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** would be isolated both spatially and temporally as construction activity moves across the Order Limits. As such a material change in the experience of using the PRoW as a whole as a result of noise emissions from the Proposed Development, which could affect PRoW and users’ health or quality of life, is not anticipated. Therefore, an assessment of

[23] World Health Organization (1999); Guidelines for Community Noise.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Noise and Vibration

noise effects on PRoW users as a result of the Proposed Development was scoped out, in line with the list of proposed receptors to be included in the noise assessment presented in the Appendix 1-A: EIA Scoping Report **[APP-118]** and as agreed with NKDC's Environmental Health Officer.

The Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE)[24] provides a means for noise effects to be identified. It allows for adverse effects on health and quality of life to occur where all reasonable steps have been taken to reduce these effects whilst taking into account sustainable development. In accordance with the NPSE, all reasonable steps to minimise the effects of noise on PRoW users will be taken during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. This includes measures such as the implementation of Best Practice Measures (BPM) during the construction phase (ref. NV-C1 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**). These measures are set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, and Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** submitted alongside the DCO Application. The production of detailed versions of the CEMP and the DEMP prior to the commencement of the construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is secured under the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** as detailed above. The provision of a detailed OEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and in line with the provision of the CEMP and DEMP referred to above, will be produced prior to the commencement of the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

With regards to potential impacts of activities during the operational phase of the Proposed Development (i.e. as a result of maintenance works), this is considered in paragraphs 11.7.47 – 11.7.49 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**. Noise and vibration levels during maintenance works are established to be comparable to those during the decommissioning phase, and consequently noise and vibration effects during maintenance works would be not significant.

With reference to the WHO Guidelines on Community Noise, paragraph 11.4.64 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** specifies the use of this guidance within the assessment.

With reference to the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-007]** and Figure 11.3 Noise Contours – Operational Phase Distributed BESS **[AS-063]**, operational noise associated with the Proposed Development would be between 35 and 50 dB on PRoWs. These levels are below WHO guidelines on moderate community annoyance and are akin to the existing sound environment in the area as evidenced by the baseline sound survey results given in Table 11-12 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]**. As such the enjoyment of PRoWs, with respect to the sound level experienced, is not expected to be adversely affected during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

[24] Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (2010); Noise Policy Statement for England

7.6 General Public: Socio-Economics and Land Use

Table 7-6: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
RR-002, RR-006, RR-022, RR-027, RR-048, RR-075, RR-081, RR-139, RR-173, RR-245, RR-249, RR-253, RR-263, RR-267, RR-291	Impact on House Prices	Concerns that the Proposed Development will have a negative impact on house prices and lead to the devaluation of property.	In 2014, the Centre for Economics and Business Research and Renewable UK conducted a study[25] of over one million homes in the UK to analyse the effect of wind farms on house prices. It found that onshore wind farms had no impact on the value of residential properties within a 5km radius. The Applicant notes that this study serves to illustrate the point, given solar panels are visually less obtrusive than wind turbines, as there are no current studies in relation to the solar sector and no conclusive evidence of solar development leading to reduced housing values. In the design of the Proposed Development, the Applicant has incorporated setbacks from housing which, combined with the maturing landscaping, provides good screening of the Proposed Development.
RR-002, RR-021, RR-028, RR-055, RR-075, RR-077, RR-081, RR-086, RR-087, RR0-92, RR-093, RR-098, RR-100, RR-110, RR-117, RR-129, RR-139, RR-144, RR-145, RR-147, RR-148, RR-155, RR-162, RR-171, RR-175, RR-176, RR-177, RR-182, RR-191, RR-194, RR-198, RR-207, RR-213, RR-222, RR-223, RR-226, RR-230, RR-236, RR-243, RR-245, RR-247, RR-248, RR-249, RR-250, RR-257, RR-263, RR-267, RR-269, RR-271, RR-272, RR-276, RR-279, RR-281, RR-289, RR-290, RR-291	Impact on Wellbeing and Mental Health due to Proximity to Local Villages	Concerns that the Proposed Development will have a negative impact on the mental health of those who reside in its vicinity, with many stating that the views of the countryside, and the tranquillity of the rural surroundings have a stress relieving effect and contribute to their wellbeing. Respondents stated that many of the villages in close proximity to the Proposed Development are tight knit rural communities, and are concerned that the Proposed Development being so close will have a detrimental impact on this both during construction and operation.	The Applicant recognises that elements of the Proposed Development have the potential to affect mental health. To address such concerns and support the long-term wellbeing of the community, including mental health, the Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to minimise impacts on health and wellbeing through undertaking a comprehensive and robust Environmental Impact Assessment and consultation process to identify and implement beneficial design opportunities. Measures set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**, Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** and Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** will reduce or avoid mental health related impacts. These include measures such as new planting to screen views and by reducing the amount of solar PV in Field 46 to avoid a significant visual effect from any residential dwellings during the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. Once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, which can have a quality of life benefit for users through improving access to recreation. The Framework management plans noted above are to be developed into detailed management plans, substantially in accordance with the respective Frameworks, secured under Requirements 12, 13, 20 and 8, respectively, of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Furthermore, a Community Liaison Group is secured through Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which requires the establishment of a community liaison group prior to the commencement of development. Such a group has already been established by the Applicant and will continue during construction and operation. This group provides an opportunity for the local community to engage with the Applicant, learn about the detailed design post consent, express concerns, and be kept up to date. It is expected on this basis that the group will play an important role in helping to reduce/minimise stress. The Applicant is also proposing a community benefit fund, the intention of which is that this will be delivered in cooperation with local community foundations and NKDC to benefit causes chosen by the local community. The community benefit fund delivered alongside the Proposed

[25] Centre for Economics and Business Research. (2014). *The effect of wind farms on house prices* (report prepared for RenewableUK).

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
			Development will provide a sum of £400 per MW of export capacity per year. The Applicant is exploring how this could best be managed. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development are best placed to determine what a community benefit would be, and should be able to benefit from funding towards improvements to existing community facilities, such as village halls and sports facilities, provision of electrical vehicle charging points, subsidised solar PV panels for community use and lower cost energy, grants for broadband and wider improvements, educational visits and wider education/apprenticeship opportunities.
RR-013, RR-021, RR-029, RR-075, RR0-98, RR-123, RR-129, RR-145, RR-175, RR-176, RR-213, RR-222, RR-226, RR-230, RR-248, RR-249, RR-250, RR-269, RR-271, RR-289, RR-290, RR-291	Impact on Tourism & Visitor Economy	Concerns that the Proposed Development would have an adverse effect on tourism and the visitor economy which would have consequences for local businesses.	Chapter 12 Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** includes an assessment of potential effects on tourism/recreation arising from the Proposed Development comprising consideration of impacts on local accommodation facilities, recreational receptors and visitor attractions. Section 12.5 identifies the size of the visitor economy and recognises that the villages of Coleby, Bassingham, Navenby and Aubourn contain visitor and recreational attractions, and that there is also a network of PRoWs in the surrounding area which may be used by visitors. With due consideration given to other assessment findings set out in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]**, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]** and Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics (Section 14.2: Air Quality) **[APP-039]** as appropriate, the assessment in Section 12.7 concludes that overall the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism/recreation receptors is not significant during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases
RR-026, RR-028, RR-030, RR-065, RR-072, RR-087, RR-100, RR-110, RR-119, RR-120, RR-130, RR-132, RR-141, RR-144, RR-148, RR-160, RR-166, RR-175, RR-177, RR-198, RR-223, RR-226, RR-228, RR-245, RR-249, RR-250, RR-253, RR-257, RR-267, RR-271, RR-272, RR-281, RR-289	Negative Impact on Local Community	Respondents have stated that the Proposed Development will be of no benefit to the local community, predominantly as the electricity generated will feed into the National Grid. There are also concerns that it will result in a loss of agricultural jobs in the local community and will not provide anything to compensate for these losses.	It will not be possible for the Proposed Development to provide electricity directly to local residents or to be used locally because the Applicant is not a licensed electricity supplier. As a holder of an Electricity Generation Licence, the Proposed Development will export power to the National Electricity Transmission System and will sell power into the wholesale UK electricity market. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals. This has been thoroughly considered throughout the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development, with input from the local community shaping the final design of the Proposed Development. For example, the proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** to maximise community benefits, providing more effective linkages across the site. Based upon the current landscaping designs presented in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. With regards to agricultural employment, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** has considered this as part of the assessment undertaken. As noted in paragraph 12.7.52 of this chapter, it has been confirmed by all affected landowners that there are not expected to be any job losses resulting from the removal of agricultural land. It is expected that

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
			when the rent revenues from the Proposed Development on the land subject to this are received, then there will be additional offsite jobs created on such farms as landowners diversify their land further with the underlying financial stability of the rental income. To maximise the economic benefits to the local community a Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to skills, supply chain and employment which the Applicant could take forward post-consent. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** also outlines the Applicant's intentions to engage with local schools, local further education providers, and local higher education providers. The Applicant recognises that the Proposed Development can assist academic research by linking with local Universities and provide local schools with learning opportunities. Furthermore, the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** provides a structure for delivering ways under which local community members can put forward their ideas allowing the Proposed Development to maximise local benefits. This provision of a detailed ESSCP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured by Requirement 19 at Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore, should the Proposed Development be granted consent, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, as determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to determine what a 'community benefit' should be. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. A community benefit fund would only be provided if consent is granted for the Proposed Development. Other wider benefits are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including energy security, decarbonisation, ecological enhancements, employment generation and economic benefits.
RR-115	Socio-Economic Assessment Methodology	The socio-economic assessment methodology is flawed. It is stated that the study area definition is consistent with guidance issued by the HCA. That document identified 4 spatial levels including national although it acknowledged that few interventions within the HCA remit (i.e. housing) are likely to be considered at the national level. As this is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, it is perverse that the study area has been restricted to 60 minutes travel area and that no consideration has been given to national economic impact (e.g. balance of payments). Within the applicant's scoping of 60 minute drive time is the Scunthorpe steel works (which melts and pours steel that can be provided to suppliers in engineering and construction). Heathrow airport, in announcing their intention to seek an NSIP for a third runway, committed to using UK steel. Although the quantity of steel needed for this application is not specified, it must be considerable and the socio-economic assessment should specify how much of it will be melted and poured in Scunthorpe and how much imported.	The assessment of construction employment generation, gross value added and operational employment generation provided in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** has given due consideration to potential wider impacts. The assessments of construction employment generation, and operational employment generation identify net job creation outside the study area, and the gross value added assessment identifies output generated outside the study area during construction. These are each equivalent to the national economic impact of employment/output created elsewhere, and whilst no formal assessment of their significance is required to comply with NPS-1 or NPS-3, they nevertheless demonstrate that national economic impacts would likely arise from the Proposed Development if assessed. The chapter provides a holistic and robust assessment of the scale and scope of effects, whereby the impacts of the Proposed Development are considered at varying spatial levels according to the extent of the effect under consideration. In regard to supply chain impacts during construction, including sourcing of materials, the approach to estimating economic impact has captured such impacts through its attribution of a 'multiplier effect' within the calculation of employment generated. This is consistent with the approach set out in the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), now known as Homes England, guidance 'Additionality Guide, A Standard Approach to Assessing the Additional

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
			Impacts of Projects, 4th Edition'[26]. This is appropriate to the assessment of economic impacts at planning stage, at which it is not possible to identify suppliers with certainty for products such as steel, due to the construction start date being some years hence. This approach is common for developments of this kind, designs are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Proposed Development be granted consent, the Applicant would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right materials for the Proposed Development. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**, submitted as part of the DCO Application, would, once implemented in full post-consent, seek to maximise opportunities for investing in the local supply chain and businesses that can support the construction and operation of the Proposed Development and other solar projects in the area. The provision of a detailed ESSCP, which would be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-001, RR-002, RR-003, RR-008, RR-010, RR-012, RR-013, RR-014, RR-018, RR-020, RR-023, RR-025, RR-026, RR-027, RR-028, RR-029, RR-030, RR-031, RR-033, RR-034, RR-036, RR-040, RR-041, RR-042, RR-043, RR-044, RR-046, RR-048, RR-052, RR-053, RR-054, RR-055, RR-056, RR-058, RR-059, RR-067, RR-069, RR-071, RR-072, RR-073, RR-074, RR-075, RR-076, RR-079, RR-081, RR-082, RR-083, RR-084, RR-085, RR-086, RR-087, RR-090, RR-092, RR-093, RR-094, RR-096, RR-098, RR-099, RR-100, RR-101, RR-103, RR-106, RR-108, RR-110, RR-111, RR-113, RR-114, RR-115, RR-116, RR-117, RR-118, RR-120, RR-121, RR-122, RR-123, RR-126, RR-128, RR-129, RR-130, RR-131, RR-133, RR-134, RR-135, RR-136, RR-137, RR-138, RR-139, RR-140, RR-144, RR-145, RR-146, RR-147, RR-148, RR-149, RR-150, RR-151, RR-152, RR-153, RR-154, RR-155, RR-160, RR-161, RR-162, RR-164, RR-166,	Use of Productive Agricultural Land/BMV Land	Concerns regarding the Proposed Development's use of productive agricultural land with particular concerns regarding grade 3 land, and BMV land. Primary concerns relate to the fact that around a quarter of the Proposed Development is on BMV land, representing a large amount of agricultural land in the area which has been farmed for decades, if not centuries. Respondents are concerned of the knock on effect that this will have on local jobs. Comments state that the Applicant has not provided sufficient justification for their use of productive farmland for the Proposed Development.	With regards to the loss of agricultural land, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. It should be noted that the Proposed Development has also been designed recognising the need to allow current farming practices to continue where possible. The Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land.

[26] Homes and Communities Agency (2014) Additionality Guide, A Standard Approach to Assessing the Additional Impacts of Projects, 4th Edition

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
RR-169, RR-170, RR-171, RR-173, RR-174, RR-175, RR-176, RR-182, RR-186, RR-187, RR-188, RR-191, RR-192, RR-194, RR-196, RR-198, RR-204, RR-207, RR-215, RR-216, RR-218, RR-220, RR-222, RR-223, RR-224, RR-225, RR-226, RR-227, RR-228, RR-229, RR-230, RR-231, RR-233, RR-234, RR-236, RR-238, RR-239, RR-240, RR-244, RR-247, RR-248, RR-249, RR-250, RR-251, RR-252, RR-253, RR-254, RR-255, RR-257, RR-262, RR-263, RR-265, RR-267, RR-269, RR-271, RR-272, RR-273, RR-274, RR-276, RR-277, RR-280, RR-281, RR-286, RR-287, RR-289, RR-290, RR-291, RR-292			With regards to agricultural employment, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** has considered this as part of the assessment undertaken. As noted in paragraph 12.7.52 of this chapter, it has been confirmed by all affected landowners that there are not expected to be any job losses as a result of the removal of agricultural land. It is expected that when the rent revenues from the land start, then there will be additional offsite jobs created on their farms as landowners diversify their land further with the underlying financial stability of the rental income. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**, submitted as part of the DCO Application, would, once implemented in full post-consent, seek to maximise opportunities for investing in the local supply chain and businesses that can support the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The provision of a detailed ESSCP, which would be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-041, RR-042, RR-041, RR-052, RR-087, RR-098, RR-120, RR-290	Use of Productive Agricultural Land for the Grid Connection Corridor	Concerns that the Grid Connection Corridor specifically will disrupt productive farmland and the use of underground cable trenching would disturb high-quality agricultural soils for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. The scale of the Grid Connection Corridor means that the detrimental impact on agricultural land will cover a wide area.	The soil survey of a defined Cable Corridor is proposed post-consent (alongside restoration to pre-construction condition of the soil resource) and is secured by the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** (which is to be developed into a detailed SMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**, as secured under Requirement 15 (Soil Management Plan) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). This survey will establish the quality of the agricultural land and the potential presence of BMV agricultural land. However, whether the Cable Corridor would be in BMV or non-BMV land, it would be restored to the same grade through the measures and controls contained within the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**. As set out in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, it should be noted that the extent of the Cable Corridor will be further refined, post-consent, during the detailed design stage to take account of any unexpected, localised issues, including but not limited to archaeological finds, implications with respect to protected species and reducing impacts upon trees and hedgerows. As such, the width of the corridor at detailed design stage is expected to reduce significantly, whereby the cable installation works require a 30m to 40m wide working area for the purposes of construction with a small number of wider areas up to 60m width, for example at the location of any required horizontal directional drilling (HDD) entry and exit pits. The cable will require the excavation of a trench approximately 3m by 3m (with at least 0.9m soil on the top of the cable), which is below the depth of agricultural cultivation, and the disruption to agricultural land would be temporary and reversible, with no permanent loss of BMV land. As such, whilst there would be a temporary impact during construction, there will be no long-term impacts of the Cable Corridor on agricultural land throughout the operation of the Proposed Development.
RR-016, RR-026, RR-028, RR-030, RR-071, RR-081, RR-087, RR-095, RR-098, RR-120, RR-122, RR-130, RR-131, RR-144, RR-162,	Long Term Consequences for Land Use	Concerns that, despite the Applicant's promises, the loss of agricultural land will be irreversible. As a result of being covered in solar panels for decades, land may be permanently damaged as a result of the reduction in soil quality by soil compaction, soil erosion, subsoil mixing, soil disturbance and contamination from degrading	The Framework SMP **[AS-100]** sets out how the detailed SMP will be the mechanism for ensuring that soil quality will not be permanently damaged – i.e. ensuring that the loss of agricultural land as a result of the Proposed Development infrastructure will be temporary (not irreversible) and will not affect the long-term yield of the land after reinstatement. For example, the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** acknowledges (ref. paragraph 5.3.2): "*Soil may be irreparably*

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
RR-166, RR-175, RR-176, RR-228, RR-249, RR-250, RR-267, RR-271, RR-279, RR-290		cables and cable housing. Construction works would involve deep excavation, heavy machinery, and soil stripping, which risk permanently degrading soil structure and fertility, resulting in long-term yield losses even after reinstatement. Respondents have stated that the total amount of agricultural land which will be permanently lost is not the 4.6 ha stated by the Applicant but at least 20.43 ha comprising solar station compounds, swales, BESS compound, onsite substation, access points and internal tracks in addition to the areas of planting and habitat creation. Reference is also made to the harm to soil quality as a result of land being concreted to allow for placement of electrical substations and solar panels.	*damaged if handled when too wet*", and notes (ref. paragraph 6.8.2): "*All soil resources to be reinstated must be handled only when dry or slightly moist*." The Framework SMP **[AS-100]** also references (ref. paragraph 5.7.1) that: "*Soils should be handled in accordance with the methods as outlined in the DEFRA document*[27]".As set out in the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** (ref. paragraph 5.2.1) "*a site representative will be appointed to be the person responsible for the management of on-site practices to ensure the implementation of the detailed Soil Management Plan."* The detailed SMP will be prepared substantially in accordance with the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**, as secured via Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, and as such will include these considerations regarding the handling of soils and appropriate supervision. In response to feedback from Natural England and the general public, the detailed SMP will include a full description of the reinstatement methods for each component of the Proposed Development to ensure effective soil management and the preservation of BMV where relevant. As such, the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** has been updated to clarify this point, and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. Paragraph 7.1.1 of the Framework SMP now reads: "*Prior to construction, site and soil-specific measures will be set out in a SMP, based upon this FSMP as a minimum, and supplemented by additional survey data where required. The detailed SMP will set out in full the methods for reinstatement (as relevant) to ensure the soil resource is managed effectively according to its ALC, and BMV resource is retained (as relevant) across the DCO Site*". As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.7.44), the only areas of agricultural land considered to be permanently lost due to the Proposed Development are areas of planting and habitat creation introduced as part of the Proposed Development given that land within the Cable Corridor (outside of the Principal Site) will be returned to previous land use upon completion of the construction phase, and all infrastructure within the Principal Site will be removed upon decommissioning in line with the mitigation secured via the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** and Framework SMP **[AS-100]**, as secured via Requirements 20 and 15 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. The extent of the areas considered as permanently lost are based upon the current landscaping designs presented in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, whereby planting and habitat creation amount to a total use of 4.6ha of agricultural land, of which 1.5ha is BMV land (Subgrade 3a). This is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** (ref. paragraph 12.7.44). With regards to concreted areas, the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** notes (ref. paragraph 1.1.4) that decommissioning works will include the process of removing all solar PV array infrastructure including modules, mounting structures, cabling inverters and transformers and concrete foundations to those elements. This would be done in line with the measures outlined in the Framework SMP **[AS-100]**. The provision of a detailed DEMP and detailed SMP, which would be substantially in accordance with the relevant frameworks, is secured via Requirements 20 and 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively.

[27] Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2011) The Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
RR-001, RR-002, RR-003, RR-008, RR-010, RR-012, RR-014, RR-015, RR-020, RR-023, RR-026, RR-027, RR-028, RR-029, RR-030, RR-031, RR-033, RR-034, RR-036, RR-040, RR-041, RR-043, RR-046, RR-053, RR-055, RR-056, RR-059, RR-067, RR-073, RR-074, RR-075, RR-081, RR-084, RR-085, RR-087, RR-092, RR-094, RR-098, RR-108, RR-110, RR-113, RR-115, RR-116, RR-122, RR-123, RR-125, RR-130, RR-131, RR-133, RR-138, RR-139, RR-144, RR-146, RR-148, RR-149, RR-150, RR-151, RR-161, RR-162, RR-164, RR-172, RR-174, RR-194, RR-207, RR-222, RR-225, RR-226, RR-228, RR-230, RR-236, RR-240, RR-249, RR-253, RR-254, RR-257, RR-263, RR-267, RR-269, RR-272, RR-273, RR-274, RR-277, RR-281, RR-287, RR-289	Impact on UK Food Security	Concerns that the use of agricultural land for the Proposed Development will have a detrimental impact on the UK's food security which is equally as important as energy security in the current geopolitical climate. Loss of food production will result in an increased reliance on imported food which comes with its own carbon footprint (i.e. air miles) and can also lead to an increase in food prices due to import duties/taxes. Respondents have questioned the strategic rationale for addressing energy security at the expense of food security.	The Applicant recognises that there are concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon food production. It is important to place the scale and nature of land use into context. As considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which allows current farming practices to continue whilst also providing other benefits, such as mitigation for ground nesting birds. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV agricultural land.
RR-100, RR-198	Land Utilisation Survey	It appears that FGE are relying on data produced in the last Land Utilisation Survey of 1974 and FGE (and other schemes) should conduct up-to-date surveys of the areas they propose to build upon.	The Applicant has conducted an intrusive soil survey for the Principal Site, and as such has not relied on the 1974 Land Utilisation Survey - please refer to Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report of the ES **[APP-161]** and Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**. The intrusive soil survey comprised at least one hand auger boring per hectare of the Order Limits to a depth of 1.20m below ground level (where achievable) in accordance with current guidance[28]. These were undertaken to examine the soil profiles, using standard soil survey methods. In addition, in order to determine subsoil structure, at least one inspection pit has been excavated for each soil type encountered. Using the information collected during the site survey and the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) ALC guidance documents, an ALC grade was then determined for each hectare of the Site. Details of the soil types and agricultural land classifications are detailed in Table 6 of Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report of the ES **[APP-161]**. 40ha (99 acres) (3.74%) of land was identified as Urban, Woodland, Made Ground, inaccessible or Livestock areas. 241ha (22.50%) of the Order Limits is indicated as ALC Grade 3a and 790ha (73.76%) as ALC Grade 3b. Limitations relate to either Droughtiness or Wetness limitations.

[28] Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (1988) Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Guidelines and Criteria for England and Wales

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
			Paragraph 7.2.2 of the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** states that the areas without data will be surveyed prior to construction to inform the SMP, i.e., that there will be "*soil surveys across remaining areas of the site red line boundary: including the cable corridor, previously inaccessible areas and compound locations etc. Sample density must be in accordance with relevant ALC guidance, i.e. one sample per 100m of linear route or 1 per hectare of site area and undertaken by suitably qualified soil surveys in accordance with the BSSS guidance".* The provision of a detailed SMP, which would be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This approach aligns with other recent consented solar NSIPs. It is the Applicant's understanding that the above principals were agreed recently by the Examination and Secretary of State on Tillbridge Solar and Helios Solar, neither of which carried out soil sampling of the respective cable corridors at DCO Application stage to inform the ES.
RR-030, RR-148, RR-228, RR-253, RR-267	Lack of Local Benefit for Jobs / Education	Although the construction phase may bring temporary employment opportunities to the local area, these will be predominantly specialised roles which will limit local benefit, and there is no guarantee of local employment. Concerns that the Proposed Development will not provide jobs for the local community nor work experience for the local kids.	The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**, submitted as part of the DCO Application, would, once implemented in full post-consent, deliver positive outcomes in terms of employment. This includes the Applicant seeking to maximise opportunities for investing in skills locally, local supply chain and businesses that can support the construction and operation (including maintenance) of the Proposed Development. The framework ESSCP categorises potential opportunities to do this by three main themes: - Theme 1 – Development of Skills - Theme 2 – Access to Employment - Theme 3 – Supporting the Supply Chain Amongst other things to provide employment and improve skills during construction, the Applicant will consider the following in the development of the full ESSCP: - A programme to promote apprenticeships during the construction phase; - Interventions to support the training of employees and works on the Proposed Development; - Engagement with Local Authorities and Job Centre Plus; - Community and voluntary sector groups which specialise in local recruitment; - Awareness raising events to provide businesses with information on supply chain opportunities and the key capacity and capability requirements they would need to meet; and - Establishing relationships with relevant Chambers of Commerce and Federation for Small Businesses. The provision of a detailed ESSCP, which would be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-048, RR-065, RR-092, RR-139, RR-182, RR-263, RR-267, RR-279	Impact of Lengthy Construction Period	The construction period will be lengthy, with long daily working hours, causing many years of disruption to the local community. The application seems to suggest that there are options around the working hours to include Saturdays. I really believe this option should be removed, to ensure that any conceivable disruption / inconvenience to local residents from the construction activities is, at the very least, contained to the standard working week of Monday to Friday. If there are any concessions around this, I feel they should be	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential for disruption associated with construction working hours, including Saturday working. As set out in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, paragraph 3.4.13, core construction working hours on-site will be as follows: a. Monday to Friday: 07:00 to 19:00 – all activities. Any percussive piling works within 400m of residential properties will only occur for two periods of four hours (between 08:00 to 18:00) with at least one hour break between the two periods;

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
		limited to the winter months where residents are more likely to be inside their homes and significantly reduced risk of nuisance caused by noise from the construction sites. Although it is acknowledged that the construction period is temporary, the impact of disruption will be intense.	b. Saturday: 09:00 to 13:00 – all activities, except percussive piling within 400m of residential properties; c. Saturday: 13:00 to 18:00 – all activities, except for HGV deliveries, works likely to generate substantial levels of noise (defines as activities generating more than 45dB LAeq at neighbouring dwellings), and percussive piling (unless agreed with the relevant local authority); and d. Sundays, Bank Holidays and outside of the construction hours noted above (including nights): no activities except for HDD drilling which could be required subject to the restrictions stated in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, future detailed CEMP(s) (which would be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), and any other restrictions agreed with the relevant planning authorities pursuant to the consent process under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974. The Saturday hours are substantially more restricted than weekday hours and exclude high-noise activities during sensitive times to protect residential amenity. Restricting construction solely to weekdays or to winter months would significantly prolong the overall construction period without reducing the total amount of work required, resulting in a longer duration of potential disturbance for the local community. The construction phase for the Proposed Development is temporary and is anticipated to take 24 months if multiple construction teams are mobilised simultaneously, or 30 months if the Proposed Development is built out sequentially. As summarised in Chapter 16: Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**, the Proposed Development will not result in significant residual adverse effects with regards to noise during construction. Table 3.7 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** commits to a construction noise monitoring plan to help ensure that the predicted levels are not exceeded in practice. The CEMP also contains measures to ensure residents are not impacted by significant levels of vibration. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-218	Impact of Significant Number of Construction Workers	Another concern would be the number of onsite workers referred to in the environmental information report, 600 workers at peak and 350 average? There is not sufficient parking to support such a large number.	The Framework Construction CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. This includes the proposed use of a shuttle service (ref. paragraph 5.4.5) to transport construction workers around the site to reduce vehicular trips on the surrounding highway network. If additional demand is identified by the monitoring carried out as part of the detailed CTMP (which will be secured through the DCO) then additional shuttle services will be provided to further reduce the number of construction staff vehicles on the network (ref. paragraph 5.4.7). Production of a detailed CTMP, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-115	Net Financial Losses	Although not classified as BMV, the land is highly productive. No assessment is given of the financial value of crops that would be lost if the development proceeds. This financial loss, net of any value of the sheep rearing, should be quantified to facilitate an informed decision.	An assessment of economic impacts arising from the Proposed Development is presented in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, consistent with the approach set out in the Homes and Communities Agency guidance[26]. This is in line with typical appraisal methods and is appropriate to, and best practice in, the assessment of economic impacts at planning stage where it is not possible to identify factors such as financial values in relation to commodities due to the construction start date being some years in the future. Accordingly, loss of crop production has been taken into account in assessing the impact on agricultural employment that would be associated with this activity. As noted in paragraph 12.7.52 of this

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Socio-Economics and Land Use
			chapter, it has been confirmed by all landowners that there is not expected to be any job losses as a result of the removal of agricultural land, as it is expected that when the rent revenues from the land used for the Proposed Development start, there will be additional offsite jobs created on their farms as landowners diversify their land further with the underlying financial stability of the rental income.

7.7 General Public: Traffic and Transport

Table 7-7: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport
RR-006, RR-007, RR-013, RR-017, RR-027, RR-028, RR-036, RR-041, RR-048, RR-052, RR-053, RR-065, RR-080, RR-086, RR-087, RR-092, RR-098, RR-100, RR-103, RR-115, RR-119, RR-120, RR-121, RR-127, RR-131, RR-139, RR-141, RR-147, RR-148, RR-155, RR-174, RR-175, RR-183, RR-198, RR-213, RR-218, RR-222, RR-226, RR-227, RR-229, RR-238, RR-246, RR-249, RR-250, RR-255, RR-263, RR-265, RR-267, RR-274, RR-279, RR-287, RR-290, RR-291	Impact of Traffic	Concerns regarding the impact of increased traffic due to the volume of HGVs, service vehicles and worker vehicles using the local road network, particularly throughout the construction period. There are concerns that this will impact daily routines and result in access issues. Respondents describe much of the local road infrastructure as "unsuitable" for HGVs with many rural roads subject to a weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes. The increase in HGV movements is of significant concern in relation to the narrow rural roads, particularly the A607 and local access routes into Navenby. There are concerns for the safety of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. The mitigation proposed by the Applicant has been acknowledged, but there are concerns as to how effective this will be in alleviating the concerns, as well as how proposed mitigation measures will be monitored and enforced.	An assessment of the potential effects relating to additional construction traffic including on severance, driver delay, road traffic incidents and safety is carried out within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legislation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A: Traffic and Transport Policy and Legislation **[APP-163]**. This assessment considers vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders, when establishing the sensitivity of the road links and junctions assessed, as noted in Tabe 13-7 of Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. This assessment concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place. The assessment has used the shortest expected construction programme (24 months), which provides a worst-case scenario in terms of construction vehicle trips as this is based on a rapid, and so shorter, construction period that would generate the highest number of peak hour and daily road trips on the local network. LCC and National Highways in their respective capacities as local highway authority and highway authority for the strategic road network, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures, and where necessary enforcement, to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. A commitment that road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets and verges during the construction phase of the Proposed Development is also made in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**. The production of a detailed CTMP (which will be substantially in accordance with the framework) for approval by LCC is secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This requirement also provides that construction of the Proposed Development must be carried out in accordance with the approved CTMP which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework plan, and will be secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The only section of road with a 7.5 tonne weight restriction which is proposed for use by construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development, is Fosse Lane north of the junction with the A46 (heading towards Thorpe on the Hill). However, construction vehicles will only utilise a short distance of this road before accessing construction access C-002 (see Figure 3-1 Construction Compound and Access Locations of the ES **[AS-021]**), some distance south of the village. The Proposed Development is not proposing to significantly increase traffic on the A607, no more than 36 HGVs per day (~10% additional HGVs) and no more than 60 total vehicles per day (1% additional vehicles).
RR-006, RR-027, RR-028, RR-041, RR-053, RR-087, RR-092, RR-100, RR-198, RR-222, RR-227, RR-249, RR-287, RR-290, RR-291	HGV Movements	There is insufficient detail about haul routes, compound locations, and mitigation for local road impacts. The Environmental Statement does not clearly show haul routes or how local roads will be protected and reinstated.	An HGV routing plan is shown on Figure 13-4: Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Routing **[AS-072]** of the ES, identifying the key routes which will be used by HGVs to travel to and from each site access. Compound locations are shown on Figure 3-1: Construction Compound and Access Locations **[AS-021]**. Mitigation and traffic management measures to ensure safe driving will be implemented as set out within the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** a detailed version of which, to be

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport
		Construction HGVs on narrow lanes (such as Clay Lane, Butts Lane, Bridge Road) threaten safety and rural amenity with 50 HGVs and 25 LGVs daily on narrow country roads (ES Ch 13). There is likely to be an impact on the state of the local roads. The rural roads are not designed for traffic of the nature which will be associated with the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Consideration should be given to the disturbance to residents as a result of increased HGV movements. Concerns as to how the HGV routing will be monitored and enforced, and what the consequences would be of non-compliance.	substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This includes usage of defined HGV routes and measures to limit when vehicles can travel to and from the Site in order to avoid peak traffic times. A monitoring system would be put in place along the route of all HGVs travelling to and from the Site which would record any noncompliance and communicate any issues with the relevant contractors/suppliers. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** also provides details of enforcement measures should there be any instances of non-compliance. Regarding reinstatement, a commitment that road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets and verges during the construction phase of the Proposed Development is also made in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**. LCC and National Highways in their respective capacities as local highway authority and highway authority for the strategic road network, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. Regarding Clay Lane it should be noted that the Proposed Development proposes to use this as an operational access only, where development traffic levels will be nominal. No construction traffic will use Clay Lane. Clay Lane/ Station Road/ Lincoln Lane is an existing junction and will only be used in the operational phase, by nominal numbers of smaller maintenance vehicles predominantly. The routes along Bridge Road and Butts Lane have been reviewed and subjected to a swept path analysis (see Annex C of the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**) and are suitable for HGVs to use with the road currently being used by HGVs.
RR-139, RR-263	Traffic Assessment	To the credit of the developers, they appear to have formulated an extensive review and proposed traffic management plan using technology such as vehicle plate recognition for validation of traffic movements be it legitimate or non-compliant. What are the practical realities of managing flows of traffic from or close to the main arterial trunk road i.e., the A46. This road is frequently congested both during peak travel times and has a high frequency of accidents causing bottlenecks and unplanned diversions through the adjoining villages, including Thorpe on the Hill. This will I fear only be compounded by additional HGV and large plant vehicles taking the same philosophy as other drivers on the A46, and driving through villages, increasing the risk of accidents and additional damage to the roads and verges. The development seems to imply that the major road plans for the orbital around Lincoln will not be an issue as it assumes that this work will be completed. What consideration in traffic flow modelling has been factored in to reflect any potential delays to the orbital as this would result in a much higher volume of HGVs during construction phases?	Mitigation and traffic management measures to ensure safe driving will be implemented as set out within the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** a detailed version of which is to be prepared, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This includes usage of defined HGV routes and measures to limit when vehicles can travel to and from the Site in order to avoid peak traffic times. A monitoring system would be put in place along the route of all HGVs travelling to and from the Site which would record any noncompliance and to communicate any issues with the relevant contractors/suppliers. The Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** also provides details of enforcement measures should there be any instances of non-compliance. When considering the mitigation secured through the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]**, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]** establishes a negligible effect (not significant) upon A46 receptors associated with Pedestrian Delay, Fear and Intimidation, and Non-Motorised User Amenity, a negligible to minor effect (not significant) upon A46 receptors associated with Driver Delay, Road Safety and Large Loads during the construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. During the operational period, effects upon the A46 will be negligible, as set out in paragraph 13.7.66 of Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**. The Applicant assumes the comment regarding the Lincoln Orbital relates to the North Hykeham Relief Road scheme. Based on the Transport Assessment for that scheme, which was produced in September 2023, the scheme is expected to be operational from 2026 and therefore will form part of the future baseline highway network by 2032. On this basis, no assessment was undertaken in Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]** in this regard, an approach which was approved by National Highways with respect to the assessment of the National Highways section of the A46 within the study area.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport
RR-115, RR-213	Lack of Sufficient Assessment and Consideration for Traffic	The impact of traffic during construction is underestimated. The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan is unsatisfactory in failing to recognise the adverse impact on local residents. A failing is that routing strategies relate only to HGVs and other traffic (LGVs and cars) should also be subject to the routing strategies. The proposed enforcement provisions will be ineffective without a system to detect breaches such as CCTV cameras (in the way that average speed cameras are used to detect breaches of speed limits). The applicant makes a number of questionable assertions, such as "the effects on public transport users is anticipated to be negligible". There is no indication that any investigation has been undertaken of the effect that temporary traffic lights on the A607 would have on the number 1 service which operates at a 30-minute frequency in both directions and, in order to maximise utilisation of the buses, the timetable is unlikely to be able to cope with such disruption without a material deterioration in the service as the day progresses. The narrow roads serving the local villages are already under pressure from RAF Waddington and expanding residential developments in Waddington, Navenby, and Harmston. The construction phase alone would involve heavy vehicle movements unsuited to these rural lanes, resulting in likely damage to infrastructure, significant disruption to local residents, and adverse effects on local businesses reliant on ease of access. The proposal lacks a credible transport mitigation plan and would compound an already strained network.	An assessment of the potential effects relating to additional construction traffic including on severance, driver delay, road traffic incidents and safety is carried out within Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, in accordance with the legislation and planning policy outlined in Appendix 13-A: Traffic and Transport Policy and Legislation **[APP-163]**. This concludes that the Proposed Development is not expected to result in any significant effects with the proposed embedded mitigation in place, including significant disruption to local residents and businesses. The assessment has used the shortest expected construction programme (24 months), which provides a worst-case scenario in terms of construction vehicle trips as this is based on a rapid, and so shorter, construction period that would generate the highest number of peak hour and daily road trips on the local network. LCC and National Highways in their respective capacities as local highway authority and highway authority for the strategic road network, have deemed the impacts on the road networks to be acceptable in principle **[RR-157]** and **[RR-201]**. Adequate traffic management measures to ensure safe driving will be implemented as set out within the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** a detailed version of which is to be produced, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This includes measures to limit when vehicles can travel to and from the Site in order to avoid peak traffic times. A monitoring system would be put in place along the route of all HGVs travelling to and from the Site which would record any noncompliance and communicate any issues with the relevant contractors/suppliers and the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** also provides details of enforcement measures should there be any instances of non-compliance. Other traffic (e.g. LGVs and cars) has been considered within the assessment presented in Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]**, as set out in paragraph 13.4.65. No formal routing is proposed for non-HGV vehicles, however it is anticipated that they would in general follow main roads/ routes to access the Proposed Development. As stated in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** paragraph 5.4.5, a shuttle bus service will be utilised to transport construction workers from the Principal Site to the relevant Cable Corridor access (and vice-versa) to reduce vehicular trips on the surrounding highway network. With regards to the comment regarding an investigation of the effect that temporary traffic lights on the A607, it should be noted that Temporary Traffic Management (TTM) on the A607 is associated with cable crossing works, which are likely to be relatively short in terms of duration (less than a week). Such a short-term scenario would not typically be modelled/assessed given that it would have a non-material impact upon the network and receptors (including public transport). Whilst the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans **[AS-008]** (see Sheet 14/16) shows temporary traffic signals, the exact form of traffic management which will be implemented is unknown at this stage (i.e. this may not actually be traffic signals); the implemented measures will be designed to minimise any impacts or delays for road users, including buses. It should be noted that there is flexibility in the DCO Application to allow for the consideration of alternatives (i.e. trenchless crossing techniques) depending on the expected level of disruption. As noted in the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** (ref. paragraph 7.1.4), TTM measures are likely to be required to accommodate the installation of the cables in the instance that open-cut trenched methods are employed. The detailed CTMP will set out such TTM, and will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with National Highways prior to the commencement of any works. The provision of a detailed CTMP, which is to be substantially in

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Traffic and Transport
			accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. With regards to the comment that local villages are already under pressure from RAF Waddington and expanding residential developments in Waddington, Navenby, and Harmston, it should be noted that, as set out in paragraph 13.5.42 of Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport of the ES **[APP-038]** given that traffic flows on the surrounding highway network would be expected to increase as a result of housing and employment growth, projected background traffic growth has been applied to the traffic flows derived from the traffic surveys (November 2023 & February 2025) and Department for Transport (DfT) data (2022 and 2023)[29] to represent conditions during the future baseline (and construction peak assessment year) of 2032 and allow for a robust assessment that takes into consideration both existing and future flows on the network.

[29] Department for Transport (DfT) (2023). Road traffic statistics

7.8 General Public: Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)

Table 7-8: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)
RR-087, RR-120, RR-196, RR-244, RR-267, RR-290	Impacts on Drainage / Flood Risk	Concerns regarding the potential impact on drainage systems (dykes, beck crossings) which could alter local hydrology or increase flood risk. Additionally, surface water and drainage patterns may be altered leading to an increase in water runoff or increased local flood risk. The introduction of impermeable surfaces within the infrastructure may alter natural drainage patterns further exacerbating local flood risk, particularly the potential impacts on the existing Lincoln Flood Alleviation area.	Regarding flood risk as a result of impacts from the Proposed Development on drainage systems and surface water patterns from new impermeable areas, the Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) of the ES **[APP-146]** discusses flood risk from all sources for the Principal Site and the Cable Route Corridor. Paragraph 4.6.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment notes the Proposed Development scenario does not increase flood risk elsewhere and, therefore, will result in no change to flood risk. An outline drainage strategy, within Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS **[APP-147]**, has been prepared alongside the Flood Risk Assessment which sets out the approach to surface water management. Surface water runoff from new, impermeable, surfaces will be attenuated and drained to surface water bodies, either to watercourses, or in certain cases to ground where a watercourse is not present in the vicinity. Discharges to watercourses from new impermeable areas will be mitigated by restricting runoff rates to the 'greenfield rate of Qbar' (i.e. the mean annual peak runoff rate from a greenfield (undeveloped) site; a standard concept in UK drainage design) for all design storm return periods, attenuating excess runoff within the Order limits; therefore reducing surface water flood risk downstream. The provision of a detailed SWDS, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Regarding the Witham Washland Flood Storage Area (FSA) (referred to in Relevant Representation as "Lincoln Flood Alleviation Area"), Section 5.2 of Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES **[APP-146]** discusses the temporary compounds for a Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) camp that are proposed within Flood Zone 3b of the Witham Washlands Flood Storage Area. Table 4: Water Environment of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, includes mitigation measures within WAT C-5; Management of Flood Risk, parts f to h, noting HDD camps will be in-situ for a short duration of 2-4 days, and provides a commitment for the Contractor to check the ground conditions onsite, water levels in the watercourse, and weather forecasts daily and postpone the HDD works if the HDD camp locations are already flooded or if heavy rain is forecast in the few days before or during the HDD camp setup. The camps can be demobilised within 0.5 days to 1 day if flooding is expected. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** also notes in WAT C-5; Management of Flood Risk, part h that no soil from trenching will be kept within the extents of the Witham Washlands FSA during the works, to ensure no loss of floodplain during the works. The camps will also be set back sufficiently from flood defences to ensure their structure is not compromised during construction. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-227	River Witham Floodplain	Comment that the effects on the River Witham floodplain and drainage need stronger safeguards (ES Ch 9). The Respondent has requested that the Applicant consider arranging an independent review of coherent impact of tidal and fluvial flooding. The Respondent has also requested a stress test of the impact of the scheme on flooding during an exceedance event, and independent sign off of timing of temporary compounds within the wash lands. The Respondent is seeking confirmation from the Environment Agency of no impact on current or	Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES **[APP-146]** discusses flood risk from all sources for the Principal Site and the Cable Route Corridor. Paragraph 4.6.2 of Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES **[APP-146]** notes the Proposed Development scenario does not increase flood risk elsewhere and, therefore, will result in no change to flood risk. Section 4 of Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES **[APP-146]** discusses fluvial and tidal flood risk in detail for the Proposed Development. Hydraulic fluvial modelling has been undertaken using the latest hydraulic model (2015) provided by the Environment Agency to

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)
		future operational requirements, including safeguarding space for any remedial or improvements which may be required to the flood mitigation measures in the rivers catchments within the boundary of the proposal during the duration of the sites operation and decommissioning. Site inspections near Bassingham, Aubourn and the River Witham Floodplain have also been requested.	facilitate assessment of flood risk to the Proposed Development, concluding tidal flood risk is low for the Proposed Development. The Boston barrier (the Grand Sluice) in Boston also acts as the Tidal limit for the River Witham, with a 1 in 300 year level of protection. Tidal influence from the River Trent does not impact the Proposed Development. An assessment of sea level rise has also been undertaken Section 4.4 of the Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES **[APP-146]** for both the Upper Witham and River Trent catchments, with mitigation provided to ensure solar PV panels can remain operational in times of flood and that they do not increase flood risk elsewhere, when excluding the Boston Barrier defences for the Upper Witham assessment. Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS **[APP-147]** sets out the approach to surface water management. Surface water runoff will be collected and drained to surface water bodies, either to watercourses, or in certain cases, to ground where a watercourse is not present in the vicinity. Runoff to watercourses will be limited to Qbar greenfield rates for all design storm events, including climate change; therefore, reducing peak runoff rates during significant storm events, providing betterment downstream of the Proposed Development and elsewhere. The provision of a detailed SWDS, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The details of discussions between the Applicant and the Environment Agency, including discussions regarding flood mitigation and Flood Risk Activity Permits, are summarised within a SoCG which will be submitted at the midpoint of the Examination, in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
RR-100, RR-198	Impact on Water Pressure (Thorpe on the Hill)	Full liaison is needed with Anglian Water as to the availability of water as the village of Thorpe on the Hill has problems with water pressure on occasions. What are the implications raised by this?	The Applicant has engaged with Anglian Water Services (AWS) throughout the design process of the Proposed Development. A Water Resources Assessment (WRA) was completed for AWS consultation, and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available Examination deadline. The WRA includes best estimates of water use at the time of submission of the DCO Application. It includes requirements for water for domestic purposes during the construction and operational phases, as well as non-domestic purposes. The decommissioning phase was not included in the WRA and nor did AWS request further information on this when it was submitted. However, the water supply requirement during the decommissioning phase would be expected to be less than that required at the construction stage as processes such as concrete preparation and bentonite clay mixing would not be expected to be required. In response to the WRA submission, AWS confirmed via email, on 28 May 2025 and 23 December 2025 that they are able to provide the Applicant with the water to meet all outlined requirements (both domestic and non-domestic) during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. The SoCG between the Applicant and Anglian Water Services, which will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**, provides further details regarding this matter. On this basis, it is considered that the water demand of the Proposed Development would not impact upon any existing issues regarding water pressure within Thorpe on the Hill, and the water assessment conclusions presented in Chapter 9: Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** are considered suitably robust given that they align with the assumptions of the WRA.
RR-028, RR-092, RR-194, RR-267, RR-287, RR-290	Contamination of Groundwater & Soils	Concerns regarding the contamination of land, soils and groundwater in the event that the chemicals, coolant fluids and heavy metals used	It should be noted that the Proposed Development design secures a number of mitigation measures to reduce the possibility of impacts upon land, soils and groundwater in the unlikely

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)
		in solar projects were to leak out from the equipment and any containment systems fail. If damaged, the batteries used in such projects can cause a thermal runaway, releasing poisonous chemicals into the ground. Once such chemicals enter groundwater, they can seep into the water aquifer (used for drinking water) or reach the rivers, having a detrimental impact on Aquatic species and Wildlife. Soils may also be contaminated due to degrading cables and cable housing which would subsequently contaminate groundwater. Although the Applicant has accepted that panels can leak chemicals and heavy metals, they have failed to provide any level of detail about how frequently the solar panels will be inspected. Will any damaged panels be immediately dismantled so as to prevent leaching of contaminants into the soil? If so, where will they be stored? If the damaged panels remain in situ until replacement panels can be installed, how long will it take to replace the panels?	event of a contamination incident, as well as to reduce the likelihood of such an incident occurring. For example, in the event of a contamination incident, any areas of contaminated gravel within the BESS or Onsite Substation compounds would be dug out and replaced. Prior to this, the gravel would be washed through to remove any contaminants, with runoff being caught by the basin. Measures such as this, are set out in Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS of the ES **[APP-147]** and will ensure that there will be no significant effects as the result of any contamination of surface water or groundwater. A detailed SWDS will be prepared, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It is noted that the Environment Agency and Anglian Water are named consultees on this Requirement, and as such will have the opportunity to review the detailed SWDS prior to any approval. Regarding damaged batteries, as noted in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (ref. paragraph 3.2.18(b)): *"The supplying manufacturer will have obligations under the Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (as amended) (or such equivalent regulations in force at the time of decommissioning) and will be contractually obliged to offer a recycling service",* whereby the potential for contaminant leakage from stored waste batteries prior to disposal is acknowledged. The appropriate bunding and further design of the temporary storage area for batteries will be developed at the detailed design stage to ensure that stored waste batteries do not pose a contamination risk to the environment, as set out in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. The provision of a detailed BSMP, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, is secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which provides that the detailed BSMP must be approved by NKDC in consultation with LCC, the Environment Agency and LFRS. As set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MW-C1), a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) will be produced by the Principal Contractor, which will set out: the waste streams that will be generated; how the waste hierarchy will be applied to these; good practice measures for managing waste; and the allocation of roles and responsibilities for waste management. All waste management will be in accordance with the relevant regulations and waste will be transported by licensed waste carriers to waste management sites which hold the necessary regulatory authorisation and/or permits for those wastes consigned to them. Furthermore, as set out in the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. MW-O1), all waste management (inclusive of damaged solar panels) will be in accordance with the relevant regulations in force at the time. With regards to the potential mobilisation of existing contaminants as a result of the Proposed Development, the Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) (ES Appendix 14-C) **[APP-170]**, states in Chapter 14 Conclusions in paragraph 14.1.1 that *"The potential risks that have been identified from potential contaminated land have been assessed by the PRA as being very low to moderate / low".* It should be noted that the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. measure GC-C1), Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. measure GC-O1), and Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. measure GC-D1) secure appropriate mitigation in the event that contamination is identified, such as works stopping in the event that contamination is encountered and appropriate remediation measures which would be agreed with the appropriate authorities. Regarding the inspection of panels, as set out in the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. paragraph 2.2.1), maintenance and servicing would include the inspection, removal, reconstruction, refurbishment or replacement of faulty or broken equipment to ensure the continued effective operation of the Proposed Development and improve its efficiency. Paragraph 6.1.1 notes that monitoring and reporting will be undertaken for the duration of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development to

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)
			ensure the effectiveness of the measures set out in the detailed OEMP(s) and related maintenance controls and allow for corrective action to be taken where necessary. As part of the monitoring process a designated Environmental Manager will observe site activities and report any deviations from the detailed OEMP(s) in a logbook, along with the action taken and general conditions at the time. In addition, the Environmental Manager will conduct regular walkover surveys which will be documented and arrange regular formal inspections to ensure the requirements of the detailed OEMP(s) are being met. As noted at paragraph 2.3.3 of the Framework OEMP, every 12 months from the date of final commissioning and before undertaking the maintenance for the year ahead, the Applicant will submit a planned maintenance schedule for the upcoming year to the relevant planning authority (excluding unforeseen emergencies that require maintenance throughout the year). As part of the maintenance schedule, the Applicant will also inform the relevant planning authority when a component is no longer operational and requires final decommissioning. The annual planned maintenance schedule must, at a minimum, include the following details: a. The extent and nature of the scheduled maintenance; b. Details of any trees that require removal and whether replacements are proposed; c. Details of transport requirements relating to such maintenance; d. The proposed timing of such maintenance; and e. Confirmation that any environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of such maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the ES. The provision of a detailed CEMP, a detailed OEMP and a detailed DEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the respective frameworks, is secured via Requirement 12, Requirement 13 and Requirement 20 (respectively) of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-028, RR-249, RR-287	Ineffective Assessment of Water Requirements	The Applicant has understated the amount of water that may be required to bring a BESS fire under control. The Applicant's proposal to provide water tanks which would provide 1,900 litres of water for 2 hours is inadequate in the light of the advice of West Yorkshire FRS to Leeds City Council in relation to a planning application for a 50 MW BESS at Westfield Road Leeds (Ref 23/00450/FU). Potentially millions of litres of firewater runoff could not be contained in the swales as proposed by the Applicant. There is a potential risk to groundwater quality from the release of firewater from the proposed BESS. The proposed BESS does not therefore comply with Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan as it is proposed to be constructed in a location where in the event of a BESS fire there will be a risk of contamination to groundwater in breach of the Water Framework Directive.	As noted in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline (at paragraph 4.3.3), each indicative BESS area design will contain a minimum of two firewater storage units of no less than 230,000 litres in capacity, capable of delivering 1,900 litres per minute for 2 hours, in line with the NFCC guidance[30]. The Applicant has consulted NFCC guidelines and engaged with LFRS throughout the pre-application phase and will ensure that the detailed BSMP includes any subsequent revisions made to NFCC guidelines. Close consultation will continue with LFRS throughout the detailed design stage. It should be noted that a SoCG is being prepared between the Applicant and LCC, which will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**, which will include matters for LFRS. The detailed design of the BESS, including the firewater storage tanks required, is controlled in several ways. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a detailed BSMP (substantially in accordance with the framework) is required to be submitted to and approved by NKDC in consultation with LCC, the Environment Agency and LFRS, in accordance with Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The BSMP must be implemented as approved and remain in place throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. In the preparation of the detailed BSMP, the Applicant will take into account good practices for battery system failure prevention and detection, consequence modelling, risk analysis, and emergency response planning, in accordance with

[30] National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) Grid-Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS (2023 and draft revision 2024)

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Water Environment (including Flood Risk and Drainage)
			the relevant guidance at the time, acknowledging that this continues to develop both within the UK and around the world. Control of firewater runoff is set out within Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS of the ES **[APP-147]**. This states that swales will be lined with an impermeable membrane or similar to prevent any pollution associated with firewater runoff from entering the ground and contaminating ground water. Automatic penstock control valves will also be used in the event of a fire to prevent any pollution associated with firewater runoff from entering the local watercourses without prior testing to ensure it is free from contaminants. A detailed SWDS will be prepared, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Such measures contained in the detailed SWDS will ensure that there will be no significant effects as a result of the potential contamination of surface water or groundwater, and as such, ensure that there will be no impact upon the Water Framework Directive attributes of waterbodies. Swales designed to intercept firewater runoff have also been designed to cater for a rainfall storm event inclusive of firewater runoff, as set out in Section 4.11 and Table 13 of Appendix 9-D: Framework SWDS of the ES **[APP-147]** to ensure the swales can conservatively accommodate additional surface water runoff as well as firewater runoff should a fire result in the closure of the penstock in combination with a rainfall event.

7.9 General Public: Other Environmental Topics

Table 7-9: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics
RR-002, RR-007, RR-013, RR-022, RR-080, RR-87, RR-090, RR-092, RR-098, RR-103, RR-120, RR-147, RR-183, RR-192, RR-267, RR-290	Air Quality	Concerns regarding air pollution due to the Proposed Development, in particular as a result of dust and emissions from vehicles and machinery during the construction phase.	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding dust and emissions from vehicles and machinery during construction. These potential impacts have been assessed in Chapter 14.2: Air Quality of the ES **[APP-039]**. With embedded and additional mitigation measures, including best-practice dust controls and the use of Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) meeting or exceeding Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 standards, significant adverse effects on health or local air quality are not expected. All mitigation measures, including the development and implementation of a Dust Management Plan (DMP) as part of the detailed CEMP, are secured in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. AQ-C1) and will be monitored throughout the construction phase. The DMP may include monitoring of dust deposition, dust flux, real-time particulate matter continuous monitoring and/or visual inspections. A detailed CEMP will be produced, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-007, RR-092, RR-155, RR-183, RR-192, RR-249, RR-267, RR-281, RR-289	Air Quality	Concerns regarding air pollution in the event of a BESS fire, in particular the impact of this on villages in close proximity. Concerns in relation to the Applicant's engagement with emergency services in the preparation of an emergency plan to be actioned in the event of such a fire.	An unplanned emissions assessment has been undertaken and is reported in Appendix 14-G Unplanned Emissions Assessment of the ES **[APP-176]**. The assessment assesses the impact of airborne chemicals and gases produced in the event of a BESS fire and shows that the dilution of gases and the distance from the BESS is sufficient to avoid any exceedances of airborne gas safety levels. The design of the BESS includes multiple layers of prevention, detection, and containment measures, as detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. The provision of a detailed BSMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework and agreed with the LFRS, is secured under Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Even under a worst-case scenario, predicted hydrogen fluoride (HF) concentrations at the nearest receptors would remain below levels identified by the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) as causing notable discomfort. At detailed design stage, assumptions will be verified, and a consequence-based plume assessment will be undertaken and approved by the fire authority. This will inform emergency services planning and is secured through the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, a detailed version of which will be prepared, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The BESS is designed so that in the event one cell overheats/catches fire, there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent which it is possible to control this)). This layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. The LFRS would be expected to let a BESS fire burn out, but the focus of the Framework BSMP is to prevent a fire occurring. There have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development. The Applicant and LFRS have agreed protective provisions to be included in the DCO for the benefit of LFRS. The insertion of these protective provisions is reflected in the updated version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which is to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics
			The Applicant has committed to a minimum buffer of 200m from the centralised BESS and 150m from the distributed BESS to residential receptors, as set out in paragraph 2.3.5 of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. This is far in excess of the 25m offset required by the National Fire Chief Council from residences for safety, as referenced in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. Design details such as this, are secured within the design commitments and proposed parameters. Under Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** the detailed design of the Proposed Development must accord with the design commitments and proposed development parameters.
RR-139, RR-249, RR-263	Impact of Glint & Glare on Birds	Evidence suggests that large scale solar farms can be unintended ecological traps i.e., mistaken for water bodies and creating a "lake-effect "for birds. Has this potential risk been considered for migrating birds?	Surveys for breeding and non-breeding birds (which inherently consider summer and winter migratory species) have been undertaken across the Order Limits, the full results of which are included in Appendix 8-G: Breeding Birds **[AS-086]** and Appendix 8-H: Non-breeding Birds of the ES **[AS-087]**. Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES **[APP-033]** assesses the impacts on breeding and non-breeding birds including displacement, with appropriate bird mitigation land provided (64ha (158.1 acres) of permanent grassland and a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable). These areas are indicatively illustrated as Arable fields A to F on Figure 8-5: Bird Mitigation Land Allocation of the ES **[AS-046]** but could be rotated within the areas of the Order Limits where there is no solar PV infrastructure, providing the principles for field sizes are achieved. The mitigation is secured in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** and secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The risk of collision between birds and solar panels was not raised as a concern by Natural England during statutory consultation and there is little conclusive evidence on the impacts of glint and glare from operational solar farms on birds. With regards to any potential 'lake effect', there is no direct evidence to substantiate the 'lake effect' hypothesis[31]. Furthermore, a UK-based evidence review of the impacts of solar farms on birds concluded that the collision risk posed by solar PV modules is low [32] As such, it is accepted industry practice that solar panel installation does not require a collision risk assessment. The maximum height of the solar PV panels will be 3.5m above ground level (at maximum tilt). In the context of existing vegetation in the landscape, e.g. hedgerows, trees and woodland, the solar PV panels will not cause a physical impediment to bird movements across the landscape. Equally, birds transiting across the landscape are doing so on a broad front, i.e., there are no topographical or geographical features in the landscape to 'funnel' or concentrate bird movements, therefore, the exposure time to any possible reflected polarised light (glint or glare) is extremely low and is not considered as part of the assessments presented in the Environmental Statement.
RR-002, RR-249	Impact of Glint & Glare on Persons	Concerns regarding the impact of glint and glare on those in the surrounding areas during both the construction phase and the operational phase of the Proposed Development. Respondents have asked whether the reflection of light from the solar panels been considered.	Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]** assessed all ground-based receptors within 1km of the Principal Site. This concluded that after mitigation measures are implemented, all impacts will reduce to Low. Impacts during the operational period are the focus of the Glint and Glare Assessment as this represents a worst-case scenario and by virtue encompasses the impacts during the construction period. The mitigation measures required to screen any Glint and Glare impacts (i.e. targeted hedgerow planting) have been embedded within the Landscape Mitigation Plan (Appendix A of the

[31] Kosciuch, K., Riser-Espinoza, D., Gerringer, M., & Erickson, W. (2020). A summary of bird mortality at photovoltaic utility scale solar facilities in the Southwestern US. PloS one 15(4): e0232034.
[32] anson C, Lloyd H and Field C (2017) Evidence review of the impact of solar farms on birds, bats and general ecology. 1st edition – 9 March 2017. Natural England, Peterborough.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics
			Framework LEMP **[AS-101]** a detailed version of which will be developed, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**).
RR-081	Impact of Glint & Glare on the Red Arrows	There are many local RAF bases within the vicinity of this application, including RAF Waddington (home to the Red Arrows) RAF Digby and RAF Cranwell. It is a huge joy for me and many of my constituents to watch our nation's iconic display team practise the loop-the-loop and roll into turns at high speeds, but the miles and miles of aligned panels creating glint and glare is incredibly concerning.	Flying ceased at RAF Digby in 1953 and therefore RAF Digby does not require assessment. RAF Cranwell is 14.91km away from the Principal Site as outlined in Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]**, which is outside the assessment buffer zone of 10km used for military airfields. Engagement has been undertaken with key stakeholders including the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) and Ministry of Defence (MoD). The matters discussed specifically included the Glint and Glare Assessment of circuit patterns at RAF Waddington only. Section 14.3 of Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** assesses the potential impact of the Proposed Development on glint and glare. RAF Waddington has been assessed in detail with the approach path into the two runways, the Air Traffic Control Tower and two circuit paths (east and west) being assessed for glint and glare impacts. Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment of the ES **[AS-092 – AS-096]** concludes that the overall impacts on aviation assets, including RAF Waddington, are acceptable and not significant. Engagement with the MoD will continue through the examination process including via the preparation of a SoCG, which will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.
RR-222	Waste from Manufacture of Components	The Applicant has scoped out waste arising during manufacture and other environmental impacts associated with the management of waste, on the assumption manufacturers have their own waste management plans. A responsible Applicant would keep this in scope until there is assurance that all processes with potential impact on waste are adequately managed. How will the Applicant confirm this for components manufactured in China?	As outlined in Table 14-22: Outline Scope of Materials and Waste Assessment in Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** *"waste arising from extraction, processing and manufacture of construction components and products are scoped out of the assessment. This assumes that these products and materials are being developed in a manufacturing environment with their own waste management plans, facilities, and supply chain, which are potentially in different regions of the UK or the world and therefore outside of the geographical scope of this study. Such matters cannot be accurately predicted and assessed as they relate to procurement decisions that cannot be assured."* It should be noted that waste generation during manufacturing was also referenced in the Appendix 1-A EIA Scoping Report of the ES **[APP-118]** (ref. paragraph 15.6.3) with regards to setting why significant waste impacts are not expected, whereby Appendix 1-B EIA Scoping Opinion of the ES **[APP-119]** did not set out the requirement for an assessment of waste arising from extraction, processing and manufacture of components. As outlined in the guidance used for a materials and waste assessments[33] *"the indirect impacts of off-site waste management facilities and material production facilities are generally assumed to be assessed (and where necessary mitigated) under the planning and permitting regime for those sites and thus do not normally require assessment as part of an EIA for a development that uses such facilities for material supply or waste management."* With regards to the infrastructure components of the Proposed Development, these have not yet been chosen. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. However, the Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and has provided for this to be a legal obligation under the DCO. This will be achieved through the development of a detailed ESSCP, which will be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with

[33] IEMA (2020) Materials and Waste in Environmental Impact Assessment

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics
			the DCO application, as secured under Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-139, RR-263	Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations	In terms of disposal and the associated responsibilities, it is understood that this type of equipment would fall under the UK Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations. If this is correct the responsibility appears to lie with the original "producer "of the equipment for its disposal. Given the projected operational life of the project i.e., approximately 40 years this would appear to represent a notable risk in ensuring this responsibility is discharged given that the producer of the equipment appears to be based in China?	The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013 (as amended) and The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (as amended) place obligations on the "producer" (such as the manufacturers, importers or brand owners) who place solar PV panels and batteries on the market to finance the costs of collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal; and the landfill tax strongly incentivise reuse, recycling and recovery. The definition of a producer and their obligations are outlined in the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013 (as amended). The recovery, recycling and disposal of waste during the construction phase will be managed by the Principal Contractor (to be appointed if the DCO application is approved) and is secured by MW-C1 of the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**. During operation the Proposed Development will prioritise waste prevention with all management of waste to be in accordance with the relevant regulations. Waste will be transported by licensed waste hauliers to waste management sites which hold the necessary regulatory authorisation and/or permits for those wastes consigned to them. It is not proposed to store waste batteries on site, whereby they will be removed from the containers and taken away straight away, following waste duty of care. In line with measure MW-O1 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** if removal of waste batteries straight away is not possible, waste and/or damaged batteries will be stored in a bunded area with fire detection prior to removal. During operation responsibility will lie with the Operator of the Proposed Development (i.e. the persons responsible for the management of the operation of the Proposed Development) as secured by MW-O1 of the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**. During decommissioning all management of waste will be in accordance with the relevant regulations in place at the time, and waste will be transported by licensed waste carriers to waste management sites which hold the necessary regulatory authorisation and/or permits for those wastes consigned to them. The types, quantities and final destination of waste generated during the decommissioning phase would be identified, measured and recorded through the DEMP. A register of all waste loads leaving the Order Limits will be maintained to provide a suitable audit trail for compliance purposes and to facilitate monitoring and reporting of waste types, quantities and management methods. During decommissioning responsibility will lie with the Principal Contractor (to be appointed if the DCO application is approved) of the Proposed Development as secured by MW-D1 of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**. A detailed CEMP, OEMP and DEMP will be developed, substantially in accordance with the respective framework plans, as secured under Requirement 12, Requirement 13 and Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively.
RR-004, RR-236	Impact on Devices & Internet	There are concerns that the Proposed Development would disrupt local telecoms and internet as well as other devices.	As detailed within Section 14.7 of Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** the Proposed Development is unlikely to interfere with telecommunications infrastructure due to the relatively low height (under 5m from the ground level) of the solar PV panels, BESS, and supporting infrastructure, which will not provide an obstacle for telecommunication waves. Therefore, no such effects are anticipated in the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Regarding television reception and internet signal, the Proposed Development consists of fixed low-lying infrastructure and is therefore unlikely to interfere with digital television or internet signals, and therefore no effects are anticipated in the construction, operation and decommissioning phases.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics
RR-002, RR-004, RR-022, RR-047, RR-052, RR-087, RR-120, RR-236, RR-243, RR-267, RR-287, RR-290	General Health Concerns	The Proposed Development will have a detrimental impact on the health of not only current generations, but also that of future generations. Particular concerns relate to EMF. The constant hum must also be harmful. The current information regarding the impact to our health is poor at best. There are also concerns for the mental health of residents and the emotional and mental health impact of living adjacent to an industrial energy facility should not be underestimated, particularly for families and elderly residents whose sense of place is deeply tied to the land.	Assessments relating to human health are included within the Environmental Statement. In line with the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 1-B: EIA Scoping Opinion of the ES **[APP-199]**), Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]** provides clarification, setting out (ref. paragraph 5.1.11) that potential effects to human health are considered within the relevant ES technical chapters, with a standalone assessment scoped out of the EIA, and cross references to the ES chapters where potential effects to human health are considered. This notes the following ES chapters: • Chapter 9: Water Environment **[APP-034]**; • Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity **[AS-117]**; • Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration **[APP-036]**; • Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport **[APP-038]**; and • Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics, Section 14.2: Air Quality **[APP-039]**. In line with the methodology set out in Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]** (ref. paragraph 5.9.12) and within the impact assessment methodology for each of the technical chapters as relevant, consideration is inherently given to human health receptors where relevant within each of the technical assessments. For example, noise and vibration, air quality and EMF assessments consider the potential for direct effects upon human receptors, and each of these have specific health limits/thresholds set for the protection of the sensitive members of the population. Regarding EMF risk, Section 14.8 of Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** provides an assessment of the potential impacts associated with EMF. Solar panel arrays emit EMF in the same extremely low frequency ranges as electrical appliances and wiring found in most houses and buildings. The Proposed Development would be fully compliant with relevant Government policy and all the EMFs produced would be below the relevant exposure limits and therefore no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development. Underground cables eliminate the electric field altogether as it is screened out by the sheath around the cable, but they still produce magnetic fields. The National Grid document 'Undergrounding high voltage electricity transmission lines (2015)' states that for a 400kV cable buried at 0.9 m depth, the typical magnetic field is 24 microteslas when on top of the cable and 3 microteslas at 5m from the centreline, with the maximum level known by National Grid being 96 microteslas on top of the cable at 0.9 m depth, and 13 microteslas at 5m. Taking into account this guidance and the UK limits set for safety of members of the public, the maximum reported electromagnetic field for high voltage cables buried at 0.9m depth would comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) limits and were therefore scoped out of the assessment. The Department of Energy and Climate Change's (DECC) guidance 'Power Lines: Demonstrating Compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines. A voluntary Code of Practice (2012)' states that underground cables at voltages up to and including 132kV are considered not capable of exceeding the ICNIRP exposure guidelines for electromagnetic fields and that compliance with exposure guidelines for such equipment can be assumed unless evidence is brought to the contrary in specific cases. However, there is potential for exceedances of 132kV where infrastructure overlaps. The Interconnecting Cables between Solar PV areas are not considered in the assessment as they would have a very low voltage of less than 1kV and therefore would not significantly contribute to any increase in electromagnetic fields should they overlap with other infrastructure.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics

Appendix 14-F: Electromagnetic Fields Assessment of the ES **[APP-175]** provides further detail on the potential for EMF effects as a result of the Proposed Development.

Regarding the comment of a “constant hum”, while it is true that substation transformers can produce a low-frequency hum, this noise would be at the limits of perceptibility at the closest properties to the substation and would not be intrusive. The Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. measure NV-01) commits to the final design of the Proposed Development avoiding significant noise effects during operation by both meeting the levels presented in Table 11-19 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** and mitigating low-frequency noise should it occur; modelling will be undertaken at the detailed design phase to confirm the noise levels at sensitive receptors will not exceed these thresholds. The provision of a detailed OEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 13 of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

Regarding mental health, the Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to minimise impacts on health and wellbeing. This has been achieved through undertaking a comprehensive and robust Environmental Impact Assessment and consultation process to identify and implement beneficial design opportunities, such as the implementation of 9.5km of permissive paths within the Proposed Development design which are used for recreational purposes and therefore have an inherent health benefit, as well as a wellbeing aspect. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits.

Measures set out in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]**, Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** and Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** will reduce or avoid mental health related impacts. These include measures such as new planting to screen views and by reducing the amount of solar PV in Field 46 to avoid a significant visual effect from any residential dwellings during the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. The provision of a detailed CEMP, OEMP, DEMP and LEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the respective framework plan, is secured under Requirement 12, Requirement 13, Requirement 20 and Requirement 8 respectively of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

Furthermore, the establishment of a Community Liaison Group prior to commencement of the development is secured through Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Such a group has already been established by the Applicant and will continue during construction and operation. This group provides an opportunity for the local community to engage with the Applicant, learn about the detailed design process post consent, express concerns, and be kept up to date. It is expected that the group will play an important role in helping to reduce and minimise stress and contribute to wellbeing. In addition, should the Proposed Development be granted consent, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, as determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to determine what a ‘community benefit’ should be.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Other Environmental Topics
			The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently.
RR-222	Possible Major Hazard	The Applicant states ”HSE ….. confirmed the Proposed Development does not fall into consultation zones of any Major Accident Site or Major Accident Hazard Pipeline.” Is this just the Principal Site? A major BPA Pipeline runs approximately North East to South West across the proposed BESS, to the South of Green Man Road, Navenby. It is assumed that, in order for the Proposed Development to connect to the proposed Navenby substation, the cable corridor would need to cross the same BPA pipeline which sits at a depth of 0.9m. I suggest that the Applicant speaks to proposed Navenby BESS Applicant, REWE1 (Recurrent Energy and Windel Energy), ie the same Applicant as for Fosse Green, to confirm whether the pipeline needs to be crossed.	The Applicant acknowledges that Prax Lindsey Oil Refinery Ltd has various interests in respect of rights and apparatus within the proposed Order limits, and has held discussions with Prax regarding this Pipeline. The interests in terms of land plots that have been identified can be found within the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** and can be identified on the Land Plans **[AS-104]**. Following recent discussions with BPA, the Applicant has agreed to carry out an AC interference study to inform mitigation, if required, and will revert to BPA on the matter in due course. The Applicant is looking to negotiate the form of protective provisions with BPA alongside these investigations, though the level of detail in the protective provisions will be dependent on the outcome of the AC interference modelling. The potential interaction between the Pipeline and the Proposed Development has been considered within Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** – see paragraph 14.7.10 (g) which notes the consideration within the assessment of “*(g) The Finaline Killingholme to Buncefield underground fuel pipeline”.* The assessment establishes the requirement for embedded mitigation to ensure adverse effects are avoided. As such the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. MAD-C1) notes the following commitment: *“To identify any existing infrastructure constraints, both consultation and a desk-based study will be undertaken prior to construction so that appropriate mitigation such as buffers can be incorporated into the design. Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) scans will also be used by Contractors to check for buried utilities prior to earth breaking site activities. The Applicant will endeavour to engage with utilities providers as appropriate.”* The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** is to be developed into a detailed CEMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework, as secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It should be noted that a full clash detection exercise would be procured at the detailed design stage, when the design detail for the Proposed Development is more advanced. A concept design has been submitted as part of the DCO Application which incorporates spatial flexibility within the application parameters to account for if localised constraints are identified later in the process. As noted above, the Applicant has agreed to carry out modelling to inform potential further mitigation if required. As per Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]**, the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, and the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** the Order Limits submitted for the Cable Corridor is sufficiently wide that the final route for the cable laying can be micro-sited during detailed design – this will enable the detailed design to integrate appropriate mitigation to allow for the crossing of the pipeline. The Applicant intends to continue to regularly engage with BPA (including with regards to the AC interference study noted above), and as requested by the Examining Authority, is looking to agree a SoCG with BPA. The SoCG will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority’s request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**.

7.10 General Public: Cumulative Effects and Effect Interactions

Table 7-10: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions
RR-001, RR-010, RR-012, RR-018, RR-020, RR-021, RR-023, RR-026, RR-027, RR-028, RR-029, RR-033, RR-034, RR-044, RR-053, RR-054, RR-059, RR-081, RR-083, RR-092, RR-096, RR-100, RR-115, RR-128, RR-129, RR-139, RR-144, RR-146, RR-148, RR-155, RR-160, RR-174, RR-175, RR-176, RR-188, RR-198, RR-209, RR-222, RR-230, RR-236, RR-244, RR-247, RR-249, RR-259, RR-263, RR-265, RR-267, RR-269, RR-272, RR-276, RR-281, RR-289	Cumulative Effects of Numerous NSIPs in Lincolnshire	The imposition of large-scale industrial installations seems grossly unfair to local residents who in most cases have made a conscious decision to live or relocate to countryside areas such as this in Lincolnshire. FGE is 1 of at least 15 such proposals within a 30 mile radius of Lincoln. Within the 15km radius of the proposed Navenby substation that the Applicant considered alternatives, there will be Fosse Green, Springwell, Leoda, Branston and Heckington Fen Solar Farms; Coleby, Navenby and Gorse Hill BESS plus the BESS associated with the solar developments; and the Navenby substation. The cumulative impact will cause significant environmental harm on a permanent basis to the entire region. Lincolnshire appears to have become a "dumping ground" for such developments.	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the cumulative impact of the Proposed Development on the Lincolnshire countryside and local amenity. A detailed Cumulative Effects Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. The short list of cumulative developments, inclusive of the relevant solar proposals in the area, has been agreed with NKDC and LCC and is provided in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**. Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** includes an assessment of cumulative impacts between the Proposed Development and other proposed projects and land allocations. This includes consideration of the Proposed Development in-combination with Springwell Energy Farm (ID 63), Leoda Solar Farm (ID 103), Brant Energy Storage Scheme (ID 108 – it is assumed this is the Coleby BESS referred to in the comment), Navenby BESS (ID 86), Gorse Hill BESS (ID 101), and the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby (ID 105). It should be noted that the Branston and Heckington Fen Solar Farm schemes referenced in the comment were not considered in the Cumulative Effects assessment due to the schemes being located outside of the 10km search area used to establish the Long List of other developments for the Cumulative Effects Assessment submitted with the DCO application (Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**). The Proposed Development has been subject to an iterative design process to minimise impacts on local amenity. Embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development such as new planting, enhanced management of existing vegetation, and the introduction of offsets to reduce visibility of infrastructure from nearby settlements. These measures are designed to reduce the visual dominance of the development and limit the contribution of the Proposed Development to cumulative impacts. Regarding the cumulative landscape and visual impact, as summarised in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** (ref. paragraph 15.5.24), significant adverse cumulative effects are identified on landscape and visual amenity receptors, however the significance of effect attributed to the Proposed Development alone is not increased when considering these other developments alongside the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The following significant cumulative effects were established during construction, where the magnitude of effect is higher than that of the Proposed Development in isolation. During construction: • Major Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects upon the North Kesteven District landscape sub-area Witham and Brant Vales due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction. Additionally, changes are anticipated to the visual amenity of users of the Viking Way (PRoW Cole/2/1 and BooG/2/2 – see Figure 2-2 Public Rights of Way Plan of the ES **[AS-020]** for the location of these PRoW) as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID95 Application Reference: PL/0087/23, North Hykeham Relief Road(as per Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**), resulting in a Major adverse effect which is significant.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions
			• Moderate Adverse (significant) landscape cumulative effects on the North Kesteven landscape sub-area Limestone Heath due to the noticeable increase in extent over which changes to the landscape character would be perceived during construction as a result of the Proposed Development together with ID63 Application Reference: EN010149 (as per Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**), Springwell Energy Farm and ID103 Application Reference: EN0110016 (as per Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]**), Leoda Solar Farm, resulting in a Moderate adverse effect which is significant. During operation (year 15) it is considered there would be no notable difference between the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, and the cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development and other solar NSIPs in the vicinity. The potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects of other NSIP scale solar schemes at greater distances from the Proposed Development has also been considered within Joint Interrelationship Reports prepared for the respective examinations of such schemes, including, Springwell Solar Farm **[EN10149]**, Tillbridge Solar Project **[EN010142]**, West Burton **[EN010132]**, and Cottam **[EN010133]**. These Reports found that, given the notable distances and lack of intervisibility between these schemes and the Proposed Development, there was no potential for significant cumulative effects. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha of Grade 3a to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is estimated that the solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire, together with the Proposed Development, account for approximately 1.4% of the BMV land in the County of Lincolnshire. Whilst there is a degree of uncertainty around this proportion (based upon available data and associated limitations of study) it is indicative that the solar NSIPs represent a small proportion of BMV land in the County. It is anticipated that these solar NSIPs, like the Proposed Development, will be temporary developments and reversible (although the Applicant cannot speak for other applicants), whereby the land utilised for the Proposed Development is projected to be returned to the landowners and expected to be returned to pre-development use (i.e. agriculture) following decommissioning (although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed), except for relatively small areas used for habitat creation, such as woodland planting, which is anticipated to be retained. As a result, no significant effects on agricultural land were identified for any of the solar NSIPs identified in Section 12.10 Cumulative Assessment of Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**.
RR-023, RR-026, RR-028, RR-053, RR-172, RR-222, RR-252	Approach to Cumulative Impact Assessment	The Applicant has commented on the cumulative effects of the proposed development and each of the other proposed solar developments in turn, but they have not considered all of these developments together which would have a greater impact in visual and landscape terms. The true extent of the cumulative damaging impacts is hidden as the TEC register is opaque. Sufficient consideration is not being given to the cumulative impact on food production in Lincolnshire. Although the percentage of farming	As detailed in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** and in accordance with Schedule 4, paragraph 5 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 'Cumulative Effects' associated with the Proposed Development, as relevant, have been considered within the ES. These are effects that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions in-combination (i.e. cumulatively) with the Proposed Development. For the cumulative impact assessment, two types of impact were considered:

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions
		land lost may be small nationally, it is disproportionately impacting this area. The personal safety and wellbeing of those in the area seems to be being ignored by the many schemes being proposed in the area. No consideration has been given to the risk of oversupply as a result of the various proposals.	• The combined effect of individual impacts from the Proposed Development, for example where a single receptor is affected by noise and traffic disruption during the construction of the Proposed Development (these will be referred to as 'Effect Interactions'); and • The combined effects of several development schemes which may interact cumulatively with the Proposed Development. The effects of these schemes may, on an individual basis be insignificant but, cumulatively with the Proposed Development, have a new or different likely significant effect on the environment (these are referred to as 'Cumulative Effects'). There is no standard methodology for assessing Cumulative Effects and Effect Interactions. Therefore, a combination of professional judgement and established guidance has been used to inform the scope of the assessment and to assist with the identification of relevant developments to be included within the assessment. The current guidance includes The Planning Inspectorate's guidance Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment which was published in September 2024 With regard to the cumulative assessment contained in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** this is consistent with the Planning Inspectorate's Guidance on Cumulative Effects and follows a proportionate methodology as outlined in Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3). The assessment primarily focusses on the cumulative schemes within the 2km Zone of Influence (ZoI), as this was judged to be the geographic area across which landscape and visual effects were most likely to occur, although the nearest NSIP scale solar schemes beyond 2km were also scoped in to the cumulative assessment given their similar scale and typology to the Proposed Development. Regarding the comment that the cumulative damaging impacts is hidden as the Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register is opaque, it should be noted that the TEC register is a commercial and grid-management tool, maintained by the electricity system operator to manage connection capacity. It is not intended to define the scope of cumulative environmental assessment, nor is it relied upon for that purpose. As set out in Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** and above, a combination of professional judgement and established guidance has been used to inform the scope of the assessment and to assist with the identification of relevant developments to be included within the assessment, including The Planning Inspectorate's guidance Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment which was published in September 2024. It should also be noted that the short list of cumulative developments has been agreed with NKDC and LCC. Regarding the cumulative impact on food production in Lincolnshire, considering the Proposed Development in isolation, it should be noted that the 1,018.7ha of agricultural land required temporarily for construction and operation constitutes 0.09% of the total farmland in the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource and is unlikely to result in an impact upon food production. Furthermore, approximately 50% of the land within the Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. When considering the Proposed Development cumulatively, it should be noted that this has been considered in the context of the Proposed Development in combination with relevant cumulative schemes Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** with regards to the cumulative loss of

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions
			agricultural land. The cumulative effects assessment considers all solar NSIPs within the County of Lincolnshire and presents the best available information on BMV land take for each solar NSIP. The cumulative assessment concludes (ref. paragraph 12.10.17) the effect on agricultural land, including BMV, across the County is likely to remain minimal, as it comprises only a small fraction of agricultural land. Therefore, the cumulative effect on agricultural land associated with the Proposed Development in combination with relevant cumulative schemes remains not significant when considered at the County level. Regarding the comment that no consideration has been given to the risk of oversupply as a result of the various proposals, there is no planning policy requirement at either the national or local level to assess or limit renewable energy development on the basis of a perceived "oversupply" within a particular county or area. The NPSs support the delivery of renewable energy infrastructure to meet national decarbonisation, energy security and climate change targets, which are need-based at a national scale, not constrained by administrative boundaries such as Lincolnshire. Where multiple schemes exist or are proposed, cumulative effects are assessed in accordance with established guidance (e.g. GLVIA3), which consider the potential cumulative impacts associated with multiple developments, rather than the concept of 'oversupply'.
RR-110, RR-117, RR-139, RR-239, RR-263	No Strategic Approach to Solar NSIPs in Lincolnshire	There seems to be no overall sensible plan for renewable energy in Lincolnshire. This site and its link to National Grid would be at least 10 miles apart and it appears that plans for large solar projects in this area are from speculative companies seeing a landscape that would be easy to work with rather than part of a national structured plan which effectively utilises existing National Grid infrastructure. This solar farm is part of a much larger project which has connections to other significant infrastructure that has not yet been built. There appears to be no overall plan for these projects and there appears to be duplication. This plan contributes to the situation were by almost a quarter of farmland in the UK could be lost to housing, solar energy and carbon sequestration by 2050.	Regarding an overarching strategic spatial strategy for renewable energy across at a national scale, the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP) and Centralised Strategic Network Plan are in the early stages of development and are yet to be published. The SSEP is still in development, with the methodology published in May 2025. The final SSEP is not yet available, with the first iteration expected to be published for public consultation in Q2 2026. Whilst not operating as a county-level strategy, the SSEP is intended to set out where different types of energy infrastructure are most appropriately located across Great Britain, take account of national energy demand, decarbonisation targets, grid constraints and environmental sensitivities, and provide a strategic, long-term spatial framework to guide future energy investment. In the local context, as set out in the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** (ref. paragraph 6.2.73), LCC has committed to becoming carbon neutral by 2050. Furthermore, in 2019, NKDC declared a Climate Emergency and set out the net zero 2030 targets for the council and district, alongside emphasising the importance of transitioning to low-carbon energy sources and improving energy resilience. Policy S20 'Resilient and Adaptable Design' of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) seeks to ensure that developments incorporate climate change resilience in their design. Policy S14 'Renewable Energy' of the CLLP states that "*The Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee is committed to supporting the transition to a net zero carbon future*". Policy S14 'Renewable Energy' of the CLLP sets out that the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee "*is committed to supporting the transition to a net zero carbon future and will seek to maximise appropriately located renewable energy generated in Central Lincolnshire*". Policy S16 'Wider Energy Infrastructure' of the CLLP recognises and supports the move to a net zero carbon future, the infrastructure around energy, and in particular electrical infrastructure and supports "*in principle, the need for significant investment in new and upgraded energy infrastructure*". Policy S16 states that to support a move to a net zero carbon future, the infrastructure around energy and in particular electrical infrastructure, will need to adapt and change to accommodate the increased need for the management and storage of electricity. The policy recognises and supports "*in principle, the need for significant investment in new and upgraded energy infrastructure*."

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Cumulative Effects and Interactions
			The UK Government has committed to achieving Net Zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 under the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Solar generation plays a vital role in this transition. According to the Seventh Carbon Budget, over 60% of emissions reductions required between now and 2050 must come from electrification and low-carbon electricity production, enabling a rapid shift toward clean electricity and the electrification of other sectors such as transport and heating. Large-scale solar is an essential part of this shift. It is a proven, scalable technology capable of rapid deployment with minimal environmental impact and low operational emissions. As the UK decarbonises its economy, demand for electricity is projected to double by 2040. With the Clean Power Target of 45- 47 GW of solar generation capacity by 2030, and 45-69 GW by 2035, largescale projects such as the Proposed Development will be crucial to meeting this benchmark. As an essential component of the future electricity system, large-scale solar must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching NPS EN-1. NPS EN-3 further explains how projects such as the Proposed Development are required to meet the United Kingdom's Net Zero Targets, recognising solar development as a Critical National Priority (CNP). The Statement of Need **[APP-184]** further sets out the need case for the Proposed Development. In summary, renewable electricity generation is identified as being a Critical National Priority and storage (such as BESS) is identified as having a key role to play in achieving net zero - BESS is an important component of the transition to net zero and provides flexibility to the energy system, as recognised in paragraphs 3.3.25 to 3.3.27 of NPS EN-1. The proposed BESS has a direct relationship with the solar element of the Proposed Development and will support its operation by storing energy when it is generated in abundance and releasing it to the grid when it is needed, increasing the reliability of the energy system and contributing to the security of supply. This increases the efficiency of the Proposed Development as a renewable energy project aiding both its operation as a generation station and the export of electricity to the grid. If consented, the Proposed Development would contribute to achieving the UK's energy vision, as set out in both national policy and guidance. The status of the Proposed Development as a large-scale solar development with BESS will allow it to contribute to delivering net zero, support security of supply and contribute to affordability.

7.11 General Public: Planning Policy

Table 7-11: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
RR-033, RR-048, RR-052, RR-075, RR-087, RR-100, RR-120, RR-139, RR-198, RR-243 RR-263, RR-290	General Lack of Compliance with Plans & Policies	The Proposed Development conflicts with most relevant planning policies at both a local and national level. The Applicant has clearly made no genuine attempt to look at alternative sites which would fulfil the policy remit to site these types of facilities on brownfield or previously developed sites. Respondents have stated that the Proposed Development is at odds with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, North Kesteven District Council planning policies, Thorpe on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan and Coleby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. These policies seek to protect rural landscapes and agricultural land from unnecessary energy infrastructure and the Proposed Development conflicts with this aim.	Appendix B: NPS Accordance Tables and Appendix C: Local Policy Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** set out in detail how the Proposed Development complies with the specific policies of the NPSs (NPS) for Energy and other national and local planning policies. The Proposed Development will help meet the urgent need for this infrastructure to support *"energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits"* as set out in NPS EN-1. When determining the DCO Application for the Proposed Development, the Secretary of State must have regard to the energy NPSs in accordance with s104(2)(a) of the PA 2008. This includes: • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3); and, • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN-5). Furthermore, the Secretary of State must have regard to any other matters which they consider to be important and relevant. Important and relevant matters include national planning policy, such as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local planning policy, such as the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. A full explanation of the site selection process is set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. This report concludes that the location of the Proposed Development comprises a suitable site taking into account both planning and environmental constraints, and operational considerations. With regards to planning policy, Section 6 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out the appraisal of the Proposed Development against the relevant Energy NPSs. Within this appraisal, reference has been also made to the NPPF and local planning policies which the Applicant considers may be considered important and relevant to the Secretary of State's determination of the DCO Application. The Applicant acknowledges that, regardless of the Proposed Development being of Critical National Priority, it is necessary to consider the planning balancing to weigh potential adverse impacts against overall benefits. The planning balance is considered in Section 7.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. In summary, it is concluded that there are no adverse impacts of sufficient weight, either on their own or collectively, that would mean that the DCO should not be granted consent. The potential impacts identified to designated and non-designated heritage assets, landscape character and visual amenity, from the temporary loss of agricultural land is clearly outweighed by the substantial public benefits that would arise from the provision of low-carbon energy to meet the need identified in the energy NPSs. As a result, the Proposed Development is in accordance with the relevant Energy NPS, national planning policy and the relevant development plan documents, such as the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023), when considered as a whole.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			The Proposed Development helps contribute to the legally binding commitment of the UK Government to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 under the Climate Change Act 2008. With respect to rural landscapes specifically, the Applicant acknowledges that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** presents the findings of an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape character and visual amenity. In summary, receptors will be most impacted during the construction phase, and the number of significant effects will drop by half at Year 1 of operation. The significant effects will further reduce as the mitigation planting will be established by Year 15 (a chosen year of assessment to align with industry practices), replacing the vegetation lost at the construction phase, enhancing landscape pattern, and helping integrate the Proposed Development within the surrounding landscape - see accompanying photomontages (Figure 10-10 Photomontages (Part 1) of the ES **[APP-097]** and Figure 10-10 Photomontages (Part 2) of the ES **[AS-119]**). With regard to agricultural land, planning policy recognises the importance, for agriculture, of BMV land, which is Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grades 1 and 2, and Subgrade 3a. The land contained within the Principal Site is comprised primarily of ALC Grade 3b with some occurrences of ALC grade 3a. There is no ALC Grade 1 or ALC Grade 2 land within the Principal Site. Full details are set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** and Appendix 12-B Agricultural Land Classification Report of the ES **[APP-161]**. In addition to being taken into account during the site selection process, BMV agricultural land has been considered in the design of the Proposed Development, in order to minimise the impact on local features, including residential properties. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains the design principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for evolution of the design of the Proposed Development. The Applicant recognises that there are concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon agricultural production. This is considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. The 1,018.7ha of agricultural land required temporarily for construction and operation constitutes 0.09% of the total farmland in the East Midlands. Furthermore, approximately 50% of the land within the Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. Paragraph 2.10.29 of NPS EN-3 states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** outlines how opportunities for solar arrays on brownfield or previously developed land (PDL) were considered and accordingly local authority brownfield land registers were consulted to identify the opportunities to utilise PDL. Specifically, this was in Stage 3 of the site selection process, where an assessment of PDL within the area of search was undertaken including land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council. The search found three brownfield sites within the search area that were 1ha and above in size. Sites smaller than 1ha were discounted due to their inability to provide a viable land parcel of 40ha (99 acres), either individually or when combined with other brownfield sites. The Applicant identified 40ha (99

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Of the sites over 1ha in size, none of the sites were large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres), therefore no individual brownfield site from the register provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50 MW. Furthermore, two of the three sites have planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. Table 5-1 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** details these sites and Figure 7 shows these sites on a plan. The search of PDL identified no land of sufficient size to facilitate a large-scale solar project either individually or in combination with other sites. In conclusion, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.
RR-015	Policy Accordance - Site Selection (NPS EN-3)	The chosen site does not comply with Energy Security Plan and NPS EN-3 priority land types for solar deployment. Paragraph 2.10.11 of NPS EN-3 references 'The Powering Up Britain: Energy Security Plan', which states that 'large-scale, ground-mounted solar deployment should be developed mainly on brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land…….with consideration for ongoing food production'. Paragraph 2.10.29 of NPS EN-3 states that new solar farm developments 'should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land, avoiding the use of 'Best and Most Versatile (BMV)' agricultural land where possible'. The Site Selection Report for the Fosse Green Energy solar farm project clearly states at paragraph 2.3.1 that the site was selected as a result of an approach from a group of landowners who were willing to provide land for the development, almost all of which is agricultural land. The site was not selected through any process to find a site that primarily or significantly comprises the types of land that that the Energy Security Plan and NPS EN-3 prioritise for solar deployment. The Agricultural Land Classification report for the Fosse Green Energy solar farm project shows that 96.3% of the proposed site is agricultural land, comprising 241 hectares of Grade 3a BMV land and 790 hectares of Grade 3b agricultural land. Only 3.7% of the land is of the type that the Energy Security Plan and NPS EN-3 state should be prioritised for solar deployment.	Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out that the Applicant was approached by a group of landowners who were willing to provide land north of the A46 at Morton Manor and Housham Grange, which comprised a large area of contiguous land, for the purposes of an NSIP for solar energy generation. As Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** further sets out in paragraph 2.3.3, given the identification of the Site for the Proposed Development was driven by the availability of deliverable land and site suitability in line with the requirements of policy and in recognition of the need to consider reasonable alternatives, the Applicant sought to assess the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints. The site selection process set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** seeks to confirm that the site identified is the most suitable for the purposes of delivering the Proposed Development, firstly considering whether it would be possible to locate the Proposed Development on an unconstrained site, and secondly whether an alternative site would perform better against the assessment criteria. Paragraph 2.10.29 of NPS EN-3 states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** outlines how opportunities for solar arrays on brownfield or previously developed land (PDL) were considered and accordingly local authority brownfield land registers were consulted to identify the opportunities to utilise PDL. Specifically, this was in Stage 3 of the site selection process, where an assessment of PDL within the area of search was undertaken which included land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council. The search found three brownfield sites within the search area that were 1ha (2.47 acres) and above in size. Sites smaller than 1ha were discounted due to their inability to provide a viable land parcel of 40ha (99 acres), either individually or when combined with other brownfield sites. The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Of the sites over 1ha in size, none of the sites were large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres), therefore no individual brownfield site from the register provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
		The site location is clearly contrary to the Energy Security Plan and NPS EN-3 in terms of the types of land that they say should be prioritise for solar farm development.	solar project over 50 MW. Furthermore, two of the three sites have planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. Table 5-1 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** detailed these sites and Figure 7 showed these sites on a plan. The search of PDL identified no land of sufficient size to facilitate a large-scale solar project either individually or in combination with other sites. In conclusion, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.
RR-015	Policy Accordance - Minimising Adverse Effects (NPS EN-1)	The proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the local rural landscape due to deficiencies in its design. Section 5.10 of NPS EN-1 sets out requirements for energy projects to minimise and mitigate against their landscape and visual effects. Paragraph 5.10.6 of NPS EN-1 states that new energy infrastructure projects 'need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints, the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate'. Paragraph 5.10.36 of NPS EN-1 states that 'The Secretary of State should consider whether the project has been designed carefully, taking account of environmental effects on the landscape and siting, operational and other relevant constraints, to minimise harm to the landscape, including by appropriate mitigation'. The Fosse Green Energy project will undoubtedly have a significant adverse impact on the local landscape and will substantially harm the rural character of the area and countryside setting of the villages and hamlets that are within and bordering the site. It is a huge project, extending over almost 2,650 acres of what is essentially a rural area. It will replace open farmland with fields of metal and glass that will be visible from the roads and footpaths that pass by and through them. I contend that the applicants have paid insufficient attention to designing a scheme that seeks to minimise and mitigate against these harmful impacts on the local landscape and settlements.	The Applicant acknowledges that there will be some landscape and visual effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Land within the Order Limits does have a predominantly rural character; however, consideration of the landscape has been integral to the design of the Proposed Development. The design has sought to respect the wider landscape and the intrinsic value of the countryside and natural environment. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains the design principles that were developed at an early stage, and which provided a framework for evolution of the design of the Proposed Development. Specifically, the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** sets out the Design Vision of the Proposed Development which is "to seek to maximise the renewable energy generation across the site for the agreed export capacity with National Grid Electricity Transmission, whilst aligning with national planning policy and aiming to minimise environmental effects, supporting the delivery of the Government's objectives and commitments for the development of a secure, reliable, and affordable supply of energy while also meeting decarbonisation targets." From the Design Vision, Design Principles were developed which, from the outset the sought to deliver a high quality design that reflects the characteristics of the Site, takes into account the requirements of national and local policy and is informed by the outcomes of both Non-Statutory and Statutory Consultation, and environmental assessment. The Design Principles prepared for the Proposed Development establish a clear framework for delivering good design. This includes, for example, where the Principal Site layout sought to avoid siting solar PV and BESS infrastructure immediately surrounding residential dwellings and small settlements to minimise the potential for adverse impacts on visual amenity and glint and glare. The consideration of planning and environmental constraints in site selection is further explained in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** and the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** sets out how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved. It details how the design has been influenced by site selection and site context, how it has addressed the findings of the environmental assessment, how it has evolved through both Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultation, and how it aligns with the Design Vision and Principles. Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** presents the findings of an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape character and visual amenity. The assessment identifies that the receptors that will be most impacted during the construction phase, and the number of significant effects will drop by half at Year 1 of operation. The significant effects will further reduce as the mitigation planting will be established by Year 15 (a chosen year of assessment to align with industry practices), replacing the vegetation lost at the construction phase, enhancing landscape pattern, and helping

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			integrate the Proposed Development within the surrounding landscape. See accompanying photomontages, Figure 10-10 Photomontages (Part 1) of the ES **[APP-097]** and Figure 10-10 Photomontages (Part 2) of the ES **[AS-119]**. In this context, it is important to note that in accordance with Paragraph 5.10.35 of NPS EN-1, *"the scale of energy projects means that they will often be visible across a very wide area. The Secretary of State should judge whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it would not be offset by the benefits (including need) of the project."* In terms of need, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 states that that *"a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar"* and furthermore, the *"Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure"* (paragraph 3.3.62). The CNP criteria does not create an additional or cumulative need case, *"the policy applies following the normal consideration of the need case, the impacts of the project, and the application of the mitigation hierarchy (paragraph 4.2.7)".* The Planning Statement **[AS-098]** confirms that the CNP presumption applies to the Proposed Development given it has been demonstrated that the Proposed Development is in accordance with the relevant Energy NPSs, the mitigation hierarchy has been applied and compliance with other legal and regulatory requirements has been demonstrated. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, outlines the landscape and ecology impact avoidance measures that would be implemented prior to, and during, construction of the Proposed Development, as well as the habitat restoration, enhancement, management and monitoring measures to be implemented once the Proposed Development is operational.
RR-015	Policy Accordance – Grid Connection (NPS EN-3)	The proposal does not seek to use existing grid connection capacity Paragraph 2.10.23 of NPS EN-3 states that 'larger solar farm developments may seek connection to the transmission network if there is available network capacity and/or supportive infrastructure'. Paragraph 2.10.25 of NPS EN-3 states that 'To maximise existing grid infrastructure, minimise disruption to existing local community infrastructure or biodiversity and reduce overall costs, applicants may choose a site based on nearby available grid export capacity'. It is evident that the intent of NPS EN-3 is to focus new solar deployment on the existing grid network. There is no existing electricity substation within reach of the Fosse Green Energy project for it to connect to the grid network. National Grid is currently considering a new electricity substation at Navenby. Its Webpage for the substation makes it clear that the substation proposal is in response to requests for grid connections from a number of solar farm projects in the area, which it is legally obliged to respond to. The three announced solar farm projects that are looking to connect to a new substation at Navenby (Fosse Green Energy,	The Grid Connection Statement **[APP-200]** confirms that the Applicant has secured a connection to the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. As stated in Section 2.3 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** during the consenting of the Mallard Pass Solar Project, (which was promoted by the Applicant), the Applicant was approached by a group of landowners who were willing to provide land north of the A46 at Morton Manor and Housham Grange, which comprises a large area of contiguous land, for the purposes of a nationally significant infrastructure project related to solar energy generation. Following a review of available capacity in the transmission network, the Applicant identified a line in and line out connection into the 400kV Overhead Line close to Whisby Hall. A desk top review of the site to consider planning and environmental constraints concluded that the site was viable, and accordingly, a formal application was made to National Grid for a connection into the 400kV Overhead Line. However, National Grid informed the Applicant that this point of connection (POC) was not available and instead the Applicant was offered and subsequently secured a POC at the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby, which was a location capable of serving multiple customers, including the Applicant. Following confirmation of the POC, further land was secured to the south of the A46 which brought the site closer to the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby to support delivery of the Proposed Development. As Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** further sets out in paragraph 2.3.3, given the identification of the Site for the Proposed Development was driven by

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
		Springwell and Leoda) are all on extensive areas of agricultural land, contrary to the land type priorities prescribed in NPS EN-3. These unsuitably located solar farm projects are thus driving the location of the new substation without any clear consideration of whether Navenby is a strategically appropriate location to look to develop the national grid network in the first place, or clear evidence that options to site these solar farms close to existing substations with grid connection capacity have been exhausted. There is no current planning application for an electricity substation at Navenby, and there is no guarantee that North Kesteven District Council will approve such an application should one come forward. Given its proposed highly visible location on open farmland, the proposed substation may be deemed to be contrary to many of the most relevant policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, especially those relating to development in the countryside (Policy S5), design and amenity (Policy S53) and possibly the protection of BMV agricultural land (Policy S67), depending on the grading of the land following assessment. It may also be considered to be contrary to Policy S16 on wider energy infrastructure given the caveats to this policy which state that energy infrastructure proposals 'should take all reasonable opportunities to mitigate harm arising … and take care to select not only appropriate locations for such facilities but also design solutions which minimise harm arising'. With no existing network connection for the Fosse Green Energy solar farm, the project is contrary to NPS EN-3.	the availability of deliverable land and site suitability in line with the requirements of policy and in recognition of the need to consider reasonable alternatives, the Applicant sought to assess the Site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints. Whilst permission for this proposed National Grid substation near Navenby has not been granted, the application is due to be submitted to NKDC in early 2026, with a decision anticipated in Spring 2026 according to the National Grid website for the project. If this timeline is accurate, a decision for the proposed substation near Navenby would be made in advance of the decision for this application for development consent. Given the generally supportive national and local policy position for low-carbon infrastructure, and on the basis that National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) take a responsible approach to siting, design and mitigation, in compliance with the 'Horlock Rules', there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant why consent for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would be withheld. NGET has stated to the Applicant that should planning permission not be granted the fall back is to appeal any such refusal to the Secretary of State and await determination. The Horlock Rules[34] are used by National Grid for the design and siting of substations in order to minimise their environmental impact.
RR-015	Policy Accordance – PRoW (NPS EN-3)	The proposal will adversely affect local public rights of way. Paragraph 2.10.43 of NPS EN-3 states that those applying to bring forward new solar farms 'are encouraged where possible to minimise the visual impacts of the development for those using existing public rights of way, considering the impacts this may have on any other visual amenities in the surrounding landscape'. Paragraph 2.10.44 of NPS EN-3 states that solar farm applicants 'should consider and maximise opportunities to facilitate enhancements to the public rights of way and the inclusion, through site layout and design of access, of new opportunities for the public to access and cross proposed solar development sites'. The Fosse Green Energy project will have a significant adverse impact on recreational walking opportunities around Bassingham and between Bassingham and Aubourn that use the public rights of way that will run through and around the solar panel arrays:	Visual impacts on the PRoW network have been considered in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The siting of solar PV panels and associated infrastructure seeks to minimise instances of any elements of the Proposed Development being located on both sides of any PRoW. Where the provision of solar PV panels or associated infrastructure is proposed adjacent to a PRoW, an offset of a minimum of 10m either side of the centre line has been incorporated. Where the provision of solar PV panels or associated infrastructure is proposed on both sides of a PRoW, sections of wider offsets have also been integrated to avoid a 'canyon effect' and vary the extent of views experienced across the Principal Site where practicable. This is secured as a Design Commitment set out in Appendix A: Design Commitments of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** which are secured under Requirement 6 (detailed design approval) of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** demonstrates that that the design of the Proposed Development does recognise and consider opportunities for increased connectivity, including measures to minimise disruption to PRoW during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning where practicable. Enhancement measures have also been explored which includes the provision of permissive paths across the Site to supplement the existing PRoW network, link existing routes. create new connections to surrounding villages and enhance existing connections.

[34] https://www.nationalgrid.com/sites/default/files/documents/13796-The%20Horlock%20Rules.pdf

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
		- The two footpaths between Bassingham and Aubourn will run through or around (through the diverted permissive footpath) the swathes of solar panels that will be sited between the two villages. These footpaths provide popular country walks that are well used by local residents and visiting walkers, with opportunities to visit the country pubs in each village. The Fosse Green Energy project will result in a significant deterioration in the recreational experience and enjoyment of the countryside for the people that use these footpaths. - The solar panels to the east of Clay Lane/ west of Bassingham will be clearly visible from the footpath that runs through the field to the west of the village. Many Bassingham residents use this footpath as part of a circular walk around the village. The enjoyment of such walks will be marred by the views of the solar panels that people will see from the footpath. The applicant has done very little to minimise or mitigate against these harmful impacts on the public rights of way around Bassingham and between Bassingham and Aubourn, or to enhance recreational walking opportunities for local people and visitors. Much more could have been done in terms of: - More thoughtful siting of solar panels to avoid or lessen detrimental impacts on the public rights of way; - Better screening landscaping and banking; - The creation of green corridors with wider buffer zones to screen solar panels from footpaths; - The creation of riverside walks. The proposal will adversely affect the public rights of way, with few attempts to minimise or mitigate against the harms and no real attempt to enhance opportunities for country walking, so is contrary to NPS EN-3 in this respect.	The Proposed Development will create approximately 9.5km of new permissive paths across the Principal Site including: • Route from Tunman Wood linking to PRoW LL/TOTH/11/1 to the east of Morton. • Route from Tunman Wood to Fosse Lane including a link to the Cathedral View Caravan Park linking with PRoW LL/TOTH/6A/1. • Cathedral View Caravan Park to Fosse Lane, providing a circular walk and safer route and access to Thorpe-on-the-Hill for residents. • East of Witham St Hughs, providing a circular walk around the proposed community orchard and linking to PRoW LL/AUbo/11/2. • Route south of Thurlby linking to PRoW LL/ThuN/2/1. • West of Bassingham providing a circular walk and linking to PRoW LL/NoDi/1/2. Figure 3-3: Proposed Permissive Paths of the ES **[AS-024]** and Sheets 1-5, 7 and 9 of the Streets, Right of Way and Access Plans **[AS-007]** show the location of the proposed permissive paths. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, (a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. In summary, the Proposed Development will minimise operational impacts by maintaining access to all existing PRoW within the Proposed Development, with suitable alternative routes provided for the three PRoW sections that will be permanently diverted (LL/TOTH/13/1 PRoW, LL/Aubo/10/1 PRoW and LL/ThuN/2/1 PRoW) and by controlling areas where the internal maintenance route crosses any existing PRoW or local access roads (such as providing gates), permitting only operational traffic to utilise these internal routes within the Principal Site. Full details are provided in the Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** a detailed version of which, to substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 18 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-081	NSIP Process	I fear that NSIP applications such as Fosse Green Energy Solar Farm take out a level of local decision making, bypassing local authorities and local people to an extent, however, the responses to my survey and local feeling on this issue speaks volumes.	The Proposed Development is defined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under s14(1)(a), s15(1) and s15(2) of the PA 2008 as it comprises the construction, operation (including maintenance), and decommissioning of a ground-mounted solar PV generating station with a capacity exceeding 50 MW, battery storage, Onsite Substation, and associated infrastructure to generate and export/import electricity. Therefore, the determination of the DCO Application for development consent is made by the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero. Notwithstanding, engagement with the local community and with the relevant local authorities has been an integral part of development of the design of the Proposed Development. The Applicant held both Non-Statutory and Statutory Consultation where views were sought. The Consultation Report Appendices **[APP-024]** set out how the Applicant has considered feedback provided at Non-Statutory and Statutory Consultation. Furthermore, the Design

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			Approach Document **[APP-186]** explains how the Applicant has responded to feedback provided on the design of the Proposed Development. In addition, as set out in the Consultation Report **[APP-023]**, the Applicant has been in regular communication with officers from LCC and NKDC to seek technical feedback and views on approaches to consultation amongst other matters. In summary, the Applicant has pro-actively engaged with the local community and local authorities, as demonstrated in the Consultation Report **[APP-023]** and Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. Local Impact Reports will be prepared by LCC and NKDC, on behalf of their constituents, which will detail the likely specific impacts of the Proposed Development on their areas.
RR-167	NSIP Process	I consider that it is inappropriate for decisions on projects of this kind to be made at national rather than local level of government; that – since the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty originally developed as a mechanism for local government (in the form of the barons) to constrain the power of central government (in the form of the king) – the power of central government to override local interests in such matters derives from a usurpation of sovereignty and is therefore constitutionally illegitimate. I intend to submit a written representation in due course giving more detailed arguments in this regard. I suggest that, until the questions I raise on the constitutional legitimacy of this process have been resolved, a decision to allow this project to go ahead might be deemed to constitute misfeasance in public office.	Under s37(2) of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008), an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) must be made to the Secretary of State. Under s31 of the PA 2008, a DCO is required for a development which is, or forms part of, a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). Under s14(a), s15(1) and s15(2) of the PA 2008, as the Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of an onshore generating station in England with a capacity exceeding 50 MW, the criteria for an NSIP are met. Therefore, the DCO Application will be determined by the Secretary of State. The Applicant has no control over the level at which the DCO Application is determined, and therefore, cannot comment further on this matter. In terms of objections, as set out in the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice for submitting representations or comments[35], the Examining Authority will read and consider all comments received. NKDC and LCC are the host authorities and have the opportunity to prepare a Local Impact Report which will also be considered by the Secretary of State in determining the DCO Application in line with s104(2)(c).
RR-133, RR-134	NSIP Process	Far too many of these massive areas of planning applications are being given permission by London. There will be no local say on this project as the planning inspectorate will just rubber stamp the application with total disregard to local objections from individuals, District Councils, Lincolnshire County Council, the Mayor of Lincolnshire and local MP's.	The Planning Inspectorate has appointed an Examining Authority (ExA) who will examine the DCO Application during the Examination. The ExA will provide a recommendation to the Secretary of State who must, under s104(2) of the PA 2008, have regard to the following in deciding an application for development consent: any relevant NPS; the appropriate marine policy documents (if any) (not applicable to the Proposed Development);any local impact report submitted by a local host authority; any matters prescribed in relation to development of the description to which the application relates; and any other matters which the Secretary of State thinks are both important and relevant to their decision. Furthermore, the Applicant has pro-actively engaged with the local community and local authorities in developing the Proposed Development, as demonstrated in the Consultation Report **[APP-023]** and Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. Engagement with LCC and NKDC will continue throughout the examination period, including through ongoing discussions relating to the Statements of Common Ground.

[35] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-for-submitting-representations-or-comments

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
RR-100, RR-198	NSIP Process	In view of the numbers of such proposals, I call for a moratorium to enable the Government (or relevant appointed body/committee) to conduct an enquiry to assess the impact of this plethora of such schemes in such a small area of the Country to enable a national policy to be produced from which guide lines can be followed. Please note that this is not 'Nimbyism', it is about obtaining a fair, sensible and equitable overall plan which will benefit and enhance the country as a whole – something that we feel has not been considered so far. Surely, such schemes should be spread throughout the country?	The Applicant notes than in the procedural decisions issued by the Examining Authority on 21 November 2025 **[PD-007]**, it is stated that the Examining Authority will disregard any representations relating the merits of the policy set out in the relevant NPS for Energy. As detailed in Appendix B: NPS Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, the Proposed Development complies with the relevant policies of the relevant NPS. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider it necessary to respond further on this point.
RR-072	Energy Policy Gone Wrong	I feel that National Energy Policy has gone badly wrong. A huge expansion of 'tin-shed' distribution centres has been permitted without solar panels on their roofs. Then, afterwards, there follows a rush to convert large areas of good agricultural land into industrial land in an attempt to compensate. I also note that the principal beneficiaries of this dramatic policy failure appear to be multinational companies, and not local communities such as mine.	The Applicant notes than in the procedural decisions issued by the Examining Authority on 21 November 2025 **[PD-007]**, it is stated that the Examining Authority will disregard any representations relating the merits of the policy set out in the relevant NPS for Energy. As detailed in Appendix B: NPS Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, the Proposed Development complies with the relevant policies of the relevant NPSs. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider it necessary to respond further on this point.
RR-249	Policy Accordance – Natural Resources	It does not align with government policy which is: "The British people should have a right to own and benefit from our natural resources" This is a private commercially-driven project that will provide no benefit to the local community. The energy it will produce will be shipped to energy-poor areas like London or even exported abroad (needing a whole raft of pylons that damage other areas). If this project is essential why not build closer to where the power is actually needed? If any of the energy it makes or stores is sold abroad then it is my understanding that this should not be classified as a national infrastructure project but instead to go through the local planning process.	Section 2 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out the legislative and policy context for the Proposed Development. The Applicant notes that what the respondent refers to as "government policy" is wording from the founding statement of Great British Energy and is therefore not policy. Paragraph 2.3.9 of NPS EN-3 recognises that most renewable energy resources can only be developed where the resource exists and where economically feasible. Accordingly, as set out in the Site Selection Report at Appendix A of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** criteria such as irradiance, topography and network connection were considered to confirm that the location for the Proposed Development is suitable when compared with potential alternative sites. The Proposed Development will help meet the urgent need for this infrastructure to support paragraph 3.3.63 of NPS, NPS EN-1, which states *"Subject to any legal requirements, the urgent need for CNP Infrastructure to achieving our energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will in general outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy. Government strongly supports the delivery of CNP Infrastructure and it should be progressed as quickly as possible"*. The Proposed Development will connect to the national grid, at the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. Although it is not expected the energy would be exported abroad, the Applicant will have no control over where the power goes once it is imported to the national grid. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO Application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. One way of doing this is by appointing a community foundation which would independently manage the fund, using their local knowledge to identify funding opportunities and help maximise benefits for local communities. A community benefit fund would only operate if the Proposed Development received development consent.
RR-222	Policy Accordance – Urban Areas (NPS EN-3)	Chapter 4 goes into great detail regarding legislation; NPS EN1 and 3 are quoted on many occasions. NPS EN3 is quoted at Paras 2.3.9, 4.4.7 and 2.10.18 to 2.10.48. In the middle of this sequence is NPS EN3 Para 2.10.11 which states: "government seeks large scale ground-mounted solar deployment across the UK, looking for development mainly on brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land."' Why is this important clause not mentioned? This appears to be a deliberate attempt to provide an unbalanced argument. When "The Applicant sought to avoid urban areas" the Applicant immediately dismissed NPS EN3 Para 2.10.11.	Appendix B: NPS Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out a detailed analysis of compliance with policies from the relevant NPS which are applicable to the Proposed Development. Paragraph 2.10.11 of NPS EN-3 is addressed in Appendix B: NPS Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** and within the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** itself in Section 6.3. Paragraph 2.10.11 of NPS EN-3 states that *"government seeks large scale ground-mounted solar deployment across the UK, looking for development mainly on brownfield, industrial and low and medium grade agricultural land. It sets out that solar and farming can be complementary, supporting each other financially, environmentally and through shared use of land, and encourages deployment of solar technology that delivers environmental benefits, with consideration for ongoing food production or environmental improvement".* Therefore, whilst it is stated that development on lower grade agricultural land is preferred, it is not prohibited in the context of planning policy and the shared use of the land supports the provision of paragraph 2.10.11 of NPS EN-3. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS EN-3 states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** outlines how opportunities for solar arrays on brownfield or previously developed land (PDL) were considered and accordingly local authority brownfield land registers were consulted to identify the opportunities to utilise PDL. In conclusion, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.
RR-222	Policy Accordance – Time Limited Consent (NPS EN-3)	NPS EN-3 states "Applicants should consider the design life of solar panel efficiency over time when determining the period for which consent is required. An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time-period or for differing time-periods of operation." It would be logical to see the result of a request for a different time-period stated in the DCO, yet the first mention of 60 years in the Draft DCO is not until Schedule 2 Para 20, "Decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning." This is not 'SEEKING CONSENT', merely a	As stated in Section 4 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, a 60-year time limited consent will maximise the renewable energy generation of the Proposed Development and allow for replacement of panels halfway through if there is a loss in output capacity. A 60-year time period also allows flexibility for technological advancements in PV arrays after a few decades, should it be available. Paragraph 2.10.150 of NPS EN-3 states that *"The time limited nature of the solar farm, where a time limit is sought as a condition of consent, is likely to be an important consideration for the Secretary of State"*. It should be noted that the non-permanent and reversible nature of a solar NSIP with 60 year consent has also been acknowledged in the Secretary of State's decisions on the Tillbridge Solar Farm, Mallard Pass Solar Project, West Burton and Gate Burton Energy Parks DCOs, all of which have been granted consent.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
		statement of intent and therefore appears to be in contravention of NPS EN-3. What justification is the Applicant giving for seeking time limited consent beyond 40 years? Given the predictions by a number of experts that rigid solar PV technology will be outdated in 10-20 years, there can be no justification for exceeding the typical upper limit (40 years) stated in NPS EN-3. Moreover, the gross inefficiency of solar cannot justify 60 years (in 2020 the World Bank produced a report (ESMAP: Global Photovoltaic Power Potential – June 2020) that ranked 240 countries for their solar photovoltaic potential. The UK was ranked second poorest at 239th (2.64 hrs of sunshine with only a load factor of 11%)).	NPS EN-3 also supports this position at paragraph 2.10.66 which states that: "*time limited consent, where granted, is described as temporary because there is a finite period for which it exists, after which the project would cease to have consent and therefore must seek to extend the period of consent or be decommissioned and removed*." The lifespan of 60 years has been identified as being a suitable period for which the Proposed Development can provide energy to the national electricity grid. Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO contains the Requirements, which are similar to planning conditions on a planning permission and are controls on the Proposed Development which must be complied with in relation to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development (as relevant). As has been stated, under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. Therefore, this restricts the operation of the Proposed Development to 60 years and is part of the consent which is being sought. This 60 year period is also reflected within the other documents included within the DCO Application.
RR-081, RR-192	Policy Accordance (NPPF and NPS EN-3)	Like the NPPF, the updated NPS EN-3 recommends that developers should try using poorer-quality instead of higher-quality agricultural land and avoid the use of BMV land where possible. In a written statement in May 2024, the previous government offered further guidance on the use of BMV land for solar farms instead of food production. It explained how these "competing priorities" should be balanced, clarifying the policies set out in the NPS: Appendix A The "starting position" for developers should be to minimise the impact on BMV land and use land in areas of poorer quality. There is "a greater onus" on developers to show the use of higher-quality land is necessary as land grade increases. - Decision-makers should give "due weight" to the proposed use of BMV land when considering whether consent should be granted. The government added that decision-makers should not only consider the impacts of individual proposals but also cumulative impacts "where several proposals come forward in the same locality". - The application states that the land could be out of agricultural use for up to 60 years, far longer than the usual 40 year time limit in NPS EN-3. In this time, technology will have significantly advanced, and the soil underneath these outdated panels will have been deprived of light, rendering it much poorer quality for future generations -again creating long-term impacts for food security into the future. The applicant has not followed the National Statement for Energy as regards the reuse of brownfield land. Nor the Clean Power 2030	Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out that the Applicant was approached by a group of landowners who were willing to provide land north of the A46 at Morton Manor and Housham Grange, which comprised a large area of contiguous land, for the purposes of a nationally significant infrastructure project related to solar energy generation. As Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** further sets out in paragraph 2.3.3, given the identification of the site for the Proposed Development was driven by the availability of deliverable land and site suitability in line with the requirements of policy and in recognition of the need to consider reasonable alternatives, the Applicant sought to assess the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints. The site selection process set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** seeks to confirm that the site identified is the most suitable for the purposes of delivering the Proposed Development, firstly considering whether it would be possible to locate the Proposed Development on an unconstrained site, and secondly whether an alternative site would perform better against the assessment criteria. The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) (May 2024) states that applicants for solar development should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality. The WMS further states that where BMV agricultural land is used there is an onus on developers to show that the use of higher quality land is necessary. The site selection process was undertaken in five stages. Following identification of an area of search (Stage 1), all planning and environmental constraints including best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3) were excluded in order to seek to identify a site with no constraints (Stage 2). Following identification of potential sites with all constraints excluded (Stage 3) and their evaluation (Stage 4), it was concluded that the search needed to be widened as it was not possible to identify an appropriate site within the parameters defined for Stages 1 to 4 (Stage 5). Alongside other criteria, best and most versatile agricultural land was reintroduced back into the area of search. Accordingly, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates that use of higher quality agricultural land is necessary, albeit there is no Grade 1 or 2 BMV land with the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** identifies four potential alternatives including Scopwick Heath, which was discounted on the basis of it being largely located on BMV Grade 2 land, despite being close to

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
		Initiative which emphasises strategic site selection for energy infrastructure highlighting a) proximity to existing grid infrastructure and b) brownfield land is explicitly preferred for clean energy infrastructure.	the point of connection. Given the Proposed Development was not brought forward on the Scopwick Heath site and that the identified Order Limits does not contain any land designated as BMV Grade 1 or 2, the Applicant has demonstrated that impacts on BMV agricultural land have been minimised and BMV itself has been appropriately considered in the site selection process. Paragraph 2.10.29 of NPS EN-3 states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** outlines how opportunities for solar arrays on brownfield or previously developed land (PDL) were considered and accordingly local authority brownfield land registers were consulted to identify the opportunities to utilise PDL. Specifically, this was in Stage 3 of the site selection process, where an assessment of PDL within the area of search was undertaken which included land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council. The search found three brownfield sites within the search area that were 1ha and above in size. Sites smaller than 1ha were discounted due to their inability to provide a viable land parcel of 40ha (99 acres), either individually or when combined with other brownfield sites. The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Of the sites over 1ha (2.47 acres) in size, none of the sites were large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres), therefore no individual brownfield site from the register provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, two of the three sites have planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. Table 5-1 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** details these sites and Figure 7 shows these sites on a plan. The search of PDL identified no land of sufficient size to facilitate a large-scale solar project either individually or in combination with other sites. In conclusion, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. NPS EN-3 also supports this position at paragraph 2.10.66 which states that: "*time limited consent, where granted, is described as temporary because there is a finite period for which it exists, after which the project would cease to have consent and therefore must seek to extend the period of consent or be decommissioned and removed*." The lifespan of 60 years has been identified as being a suitable period of time during which the Proposed Development can provide energy to the national electricity grid. With regards to soil quality, the Proposed Development will result in benefits to soil resources. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, while the Proposed Development is operational the soil resource within the Principal Site would remain under a perennial grass cover, before being returned to the landowners and available for its current use, although it will be the decision of the landowners as to how they use and manage the land, following decommissioning. This would provide multiple benefits to the soil, enhancing the functional capacity of the soil resources for future arable production. Furthermore, bare soil structures would not be vulnerable to wind and water erosion, there would be improved infiltration of rainwater reducing erosive surface water runoff, greater exploitation of subsoil by plant roots which improves drainage and loosens compacted soils, and the recovery of topsoil

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			organic matter which would improve aggregate stability, water holding capacity and plant nutrient availability.
thRR-139, RR-172, RR-174, RR-263	Requirement for Sequential Test	The Government policies require a sequential test which is not demonstrated here. There is no grid connection here. Government stated that "...planning guidance makes clear that, wherever possible, developers should utilise brownfield, industrial, contaminated, or previously developed land."	Paragraph 2.10.29 of NPS EN-3 states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** outlines how opportunities for solar arrays on brownfield or previously developed land (PDL) were considered and accordingly local authority brownfield land registers were consulted to identify the opportunities to utilise PDL. Specifically, this was in Stage 3 of the site selection process, where an assessment of PDL within the area of search was undertaken which included land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council. The search found three brownfield sites within the search area that were 1ha and above in size. Sites smaller than 1ha were discounted due to their inability to provide a viable land parcel of 40ha (99 acres), either individually or when combined with other brownfield sites. The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Of the sites over 1ha in size (2.47 acres), none of the sites were large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres), therefore no individual brownfield site from the register provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, two of the three sites have planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. Table 5-1 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** detailed these sites and Figure 7 showed these sites on a plan. The search of PDL identified no land of sufficient size to facilitate a large-scale solar project either individually or in combination with other sites. In conclusion, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. In terms of the Sequential test for flood risk, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the sequential test was taken into account in site selection, which was undertaken in five stages. Following identification of an area of search (Stage 1), all planning and environmental constraints including areas at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3) were excluded in order to seek to identify a site with no constraints (Stage 2). Following identification of potential sites with all constraints excluded (Stage 3) and their evaluation (Stage 4), it was concluded that the search needed to be widened as it was not possible to identify an appropriate site within the parameters defined for Stages 1 to 4 (Stage 5). Alongside other criteria, land within Flood Zones 2 and 3 was reintroduced back into the area of search. With constraints reintroduced, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** concludes that the location of the Proposed Development comprises the preferred site when compared with other potential alternative sites when taking into account planning and environmental constraints and operational considerations. Given the efforts made to identify a suitable site in initial consideration of areas at low risk of flooding and then higher risk areas, it has been demonstrated that the sequential test has been applied and satisfied as part of site selection. In terms of applying the sequential test at a site level, all proposed buildings, compound areas, the Onsite Substation and BESS and the majority of the solar PV panels will be located in Flood

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			Zone 1. This is in accordance with Design Principle 6 set out in the Design Approach Document **[AS-098]**, which seeks to ensure that "The Proposed Development will be designed to be resilient to flood risk now and in the future, with close engagement with the Environment Agency." The location of solar infrastructure in relation to the Design Principle 6 and the sequential test will be secured via the Design Commitments as set out in Appendix A-1: Design Commitments of the Design Approach Document **[AS-098]**. Engagement with the Environment Agency will continue via a SoCG, which will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority's request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**, that includes flood related matters. There are areas where Solar PV panels are located within Flood Zone 2 and the climate change extents of Flood Zone 3a. While there are areas of lower flood risk within the Principal Site, the need to balance areas for solar generation with the provision of environmental mitigation, such as the provision of land for bird mitigation in a dispersed nature in order not to create flocking, and the need to retain intervisibility between heritage assets has resulted in the need for solar PV panels to be located within areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3a, with no other reasonably available locations within the site itself. This is required in order for the Proposed Development to maximise the delivery of low-carbon renewable energy. The sequential test is therefore considered passed for the Principal Site due to flood risk from any source to be low following the embedded mitigation. Furthermore, Appendix 9-C: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES **[APP-146]** sets out a comprehensive assessment of flood risk for the Proposed Development and concludes that the area of the Proposed Development remains safe for its lifetime and does not increase flood risk elsewhere. The Sequential Test is passed for the Principal Site due to flood risk from any source to be low following the embedded mitigation. The Grid Connection Statement **[APP-200]** confirms that the Applicant has secured a connection to the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby.
RR-013	Central Lincolnshire Local Plan	I strongly oppose Fossegreen Solar Farm and all that comes with it. The application fails to meet multiple criteria within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan: - S16 calls for minimal environmental impact and an assessment of alternatives—both lacking here. Article I. S67: The site's high-grade agricultural soil should be preserved, not industrialised. 1) S53: The visual and character impact on the rural environment is significant. - S14: The local community would suffer from noise, dust, and traffic disruption. - S47: Rural lanes cannot support additional heavy traffic, and safety is a major concern. - S57 and S43: Heritage and tourism would be adversely affected.	NKDC and LCC as the host authorities have the opportunity to prepare a Local Impact Report (LIR) which will consider local planning policies. The LIRs will also be considered by the Secretary of State in determining the DCO application in accordance with s104(2)(c) of the PA 2008. Specifically, regarding these policies from the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, they have been addressed individually in Appendix C: Local Policy Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. This includes an assessment of policy compliance against the energy, BMV, design, transport and the historic environment.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
RR-015	Policy Accordance (NPS EN-1 and NPS NE-3)	I have been monitoring the Fosse Green Energy project closely. I attended the initial Community Consultation event in Bassingham's Hammond Hall in October 2023. I submitted comments to the Stakeholder Consultation. I am deeply concerned about the climate crisis and fully support the Government's objectives for reducing carbon emissions, achieving Net Zero, and securing the country's energy security. I understand that the Government sees a significant increase in solar farm development in suitable locations as having a key role to play in achieving these objectives, as articulated in NPS EN-1 for Energy and NPS EN-3 for Renewable Energy Infrastructure. I believe that it is important that new solar farm developments should fully comply with the provisions of NPS EN-1 and EN-3.	Appraisal of the Proposed Development against the relevant NPS for Energy is set out in Appendix B: NPS Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. The Planning Statement **[AS-098]** concludes that the substantial benefits of the Proposed Development clearly and demonstrably outweigh the harms that would arise with the proposed mitigation measures in place. Adverse effects would be localised, short-term, temporary and/or reversible at the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. As a result, the Proposed Development is in accordance with the NPS for Energy, national planning policy and the relevant development plan documents when considered as a whole.
RR-028	Policy Accordance	Policy S14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (adopted 2023) states that renewal energy schemes will only be supported where, inter alia, impacts are acceptable having considered the impacts on… visual amenity and that testing compliance with this will be via applicable policies such as a Neighbourhood Plan. For example, policy ES5 of Bassingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2036 provides that any technologies or infrastructure should not detract from the rural, visual and historic character of the village and the surrounding landscape setting and environment. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development complies with Policy S14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and Policy ES5 of the Bassingham Neighbourhood Plan.	Compliance of the Proposed Development against Policy S14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and Policy ES5 of the Bassingham Neighbourhood Plan has been addressed in Appendix C: Local Policy Accordance Tables of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. As discussed in Section 7 of the Planning Statement Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, overall, the Proposed Development accords with the relevant NPS for Energy, and where required it has been demonstrated that any adverse effects arising as a result of the Proposed Development are outweighed by the substantial benefits that are delivered. The Proposed Development seeks to avoid and mitigate impacts on the environment and sensitive receptors where possible. There are no sensitive designations to prevent the Proposed Development help to deliver the Critical National Priority infrastructure to contribute to the UK's urgent requirement for the delivery of new renewable energy generation capacity and infrastructure.
RR-227	Lack of Justification for Compulsory Purchase	Land use and CPO: extensive loss of productive farmland and compulsory acquisition. Book of Refences shows widespread permanent land take of high-quality farmland. (Book of Reference 4.3). The development site consists predominantly of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grade 3a), as confirmed by the project's own Agricultural Land Classification Report (Appendix 12-B). Only small areas are classed as Subgrade 3b. This land is highly productive and currently used for arable cropping such as wheat and maize. DEFRA's Land Use Framework and the NPPF say such land should be protected. The proposal would cause long-term loss of productive farmland and should be reviewed against the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP). Request: Justify compulsory purchase, review against the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan and secure soil restoration commitments.	The Applicant has sought to reduce the need for the use of Compulsory Acquisition powers given that the availability of landowners willing to lease land for the Proposed Development has been important consideration. The Applicant's justification for its use of compulsory acquisition powers is set out in the Statement of Reasons **[APP-020]** where the Applicant also explains its approach to the use of compulsory acquisition powers. The Applicant has entered into option agreements with the majority of the landowners of the Principal Site and has agreed heads of terms with the majority of the cable corridor landowners. The Applicant is in continued discussions with the affected landowners to agree voluntary agreements wherever possible and to rely on compulsory acquisition powers as a last resort only. The Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition powers alongside voluntary negotiations with landowners to ensure that easements and other private rights identified as affecting the land can be extinguished or suspended, so as to facilitate the construction and operation of the Proposed Development without hindrance. Furthermore, there may be unknown rights, restrictions, easements or servitudes affecting that land which also need to be extinguished in order to facilitate the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This approach of seeking powers of compulsory acquisition in the DCO Application for the Order and, in parallel, conducting negotiations to acquire land by agreement, accords with paragraph 26 of the Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land' (September 2013) ("CA Guidance").

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy

Under section 122 of the Planning Act 2008, an Order which includes compulsory acquisition powers may be granted only if the conditions in sections 122(2) and 122(3) are met. The conditions to be met are that:

- the land is required for the development to which the Order relates or is required to facilitate or is incidental to the development; and
- there is a compelling case in the public interest for inclusion of powers of compulsory acquisition in the Order (section 122(3)). The Secretary of State must be persuaded that the public benefits from the compulsory acquisition will outweigh the private loss suffered by those whose land is to be acquired.

At paragraph 11, the CA Guidance states that there must be no doubt in the decision maker's mind as to the purposes to which the land to be acquired is to be put. It should be demonstrated that the land is needed for the authorised development and that it is no more than is reasonably required for the Proposed Development. Any land that is incidental to or is required to facilitate the development should also be limited to that which is no more than reasonably necessary, and it should be made clear to the decision maker that this is the case.

As set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** a site of approximately 1,000 hectares (ha) (2,471 acres) is required, taking into account the necessary solar infrastructure, the need for land to provide environmental mitigation and the need to retain flexibility. 1,000 ha (2,471 acres) is the approximate land area (excluding the Grid Connection Corridor) required to support the Proposed Development. Of this land area, approximately 475 ha (1,174 acres) would comprise the energy generation hectarage. The Site Selection Report also considered the alternatives and modification to the Proposed Development to minimise the potential land take. Since the submission of the DCO Application the Applicant has considered the land required and further removed a small parcel of land near Thurlby from the Order Limits, which was shown as part of Change Request 1 **[AS-103]**, further demonstrating how the Applicant meets the test in section 122(2) of the Planning Act 2008. This is secured via the Works Plans **[AS-105]**, and other secured Plans, which have been submitted to the Examination as part of Change Request 1 **[AS-103]**.

In meeting the conditions of Section 122(3), the Secretary of State must be satisfied that there is a compelling case for the Proposed Development and that the public benefits of the Proposed Development outweigh the harm to those whose land is compulsorily acquired. The Statement of Need **[APP-184]** and the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** set out the need for the Proposed Development. A summary of the need for the Proposed Development is set out below.

Decarbonisation is a UK legal requirement and is of global significance. It cannot be allowed to fail, and urgent actions are required in the UK and abroad, to keep decarbonisation on track to limit global warming.

Solar generation plays an important part in decarbonising the UK's electricity sector and is a key step towards the UK Government's objective of reducing the carbon intensity of grid electricity to well below 50g CO2e/kWh by 2030, as described in its Clean Power 2030 Action Plan.

The current suite of energy-related NPS' makes a compelling case for the urgent need for additional low-carbon electricity generation technologies, including gas with carbon capture and

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy

storage (CCS), new nuclear, but particularly for both onshore and offshore wind, or solar photovoltaics. The NPSs, particularly EN-1 (Overarching NPS for Energy) and EN-3 (NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure) clearly indicate that utility-scale ground-mounted solar farms have a critical role to play in achieving delivering the government's multiple policy objectives for the energy system:

"… to ensure that our supply of energy always remains secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with net zero emissions in 2050 for a wide range of future scenarios, including through delivery of our carbon budgets and Nationally Determined Contributions" (Ref 11, Paragraph 3.2.1).

The NPSs establish a critical national priority for the provision of nationally significant low-carbon infrastructure, which includes utility-scale solar farms, because a combination of many or all types of such infrastructure is urgently required for both energy security and Net Zero. NPS EN-1 states that:

"*For projects which qualify as CNP Infrastructure, it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects in all but the most exceptional cases*" (Ref 1 Paragraph 4.1.7).

The Proposed Development is CNP Infrastructure; therefore, it follows that the urgent need for the Proposed Development in achieving the UK's energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial and net zero benefits, will outweigh any other residual impacts (EN-1, para 3.3.63).

The Proposed Development would ensure meaningful and timely contributions to UK decarbonisation and security of supply, which is critical on the path to Net Zero. Without the Proposed Development, a significant and vital opportunity to develop a large-scale low-carbon generation scheme will have been lost, materially increasing the risk that future Carbon Budgets and Net Zero 2050 will not be achieved.

In addition to meeting the urgent national need for secure and affordable low-carbon energy infrastructure, the Proposed Development will deliver other benefits, many of which have been maximised and will be delivered as a result of the Proposed Development's careful design. These include

- The Proposed Development is committed to delivering a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with Requirement 8 (2) of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and as set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report **[APP-194]**
- The Proposed Development will also create new permissive paths across the Principal Site. Approximately 9.5km of new permissive paths are proposed to supplement the existing PRoW network, link existing routes and create new and enhance existing connections to surrounding villages. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits.
- The Applicant estimates that construction of the Proposed Development will create a peak of 600 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs and an average of 350 gross direct FTE jobs

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy

over the 24 month construction period It is estimated that 45% of these could be sourced from the local area
- To maximise the economic benefits to the local community a Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to skills, supply chain and employment which the Applicant could take forward post-consent. This includes apprenticeships and workforce training; and
- In addition to job creation, the total Gross Value Added (GVA) from construction is estimated to contribute £27.4 million to the national economy

The Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP) and Centralised Strategic Network Plan are in the early stages of development and are yet to be published. The SSEP is still in development and as such, the final SSEP is not yet available.

Planning policy recognises the importance, for agriculture, of BMV land, which is Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grades 1, 2, and Subgrade 3a. The land contained within the Principal Site is comprised primarily of ALC Grade 3b with some occurrences of ALC grade 3a. There is no ALC Grade 1 or ALC Grade 2 land within the Principal Site. Soil surveys have been undertaken for the Principal Site, with results published in Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report **[APP-161]** of the ES. The use of agricultural land, including BMV land, has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2, as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect.

It should be noted that the Proposed Development has been designed in recognition of the need to allow current farming practices to continue where possible. The Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land.

It is important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land would not be permanent. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. A Framework SMP **[AS-100]** supports the management of soil, through measures to help reduce impacts on soil. A detailed SMP, substantially in accordance with this framework plan will be secured via Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-152	Government Policies	Before expanding solar farms, it should be a legal requirement that all households in the area are equipped with solar panels—ideally provided free of charge. I speak from experience, having installed solar panels on my own home at personal expense, and I believe this grassroots approach would be far more equitable and effective.	As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such decentralised energy generation on roof tops, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar schemes, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable electricity generation mix required to meet the energy security and decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1.
RR-228	No Contribution to Net Zero	This will not help NKDC with its goal of net zero by 2030 given the current timeframes as it will not be built by then	The Statement of Need **[APP-184]** describes how the Proposed Development is consistent with the relevant aspects of UK Government policy as it relates to the provision of energy infrastructure. The Proposed Development is required to support the delivery of the UK's legally binding emissions reduction targets, under The Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended) while maintaining national security of supply. The Climate Change Act 2008 commits the UK government by law to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 100% of 1990 levels (Net Zero) by 2050.
RR-175, RR-176	Exaggeration of Benefit	The belief that the environmental and economic benefits of utility scale solar power generation in the UK climate are being exaggerated and do not begin to justify the effective industrialisation of our beautiful rural landscape.	The NPSs for Energy, specifically NPS EN-1, focus on the general presumption in favour of granting consent for applications for renewable energy where there is an urgent need for infrastructure that is defined as being of critical national importance, such as the Proposed Development, stating at paragraph 4.2.15 that where the Critical National Priority (CNP) presumption applies and residual impacts remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, "these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure". As stated in section 7 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, the Proposed Development seeks to avoid and mitigate impacts on the environment and sensitive receptors where possible, with the benefits outweighing any impact. The Proposed Development will help to deliver the CNP infrastructure to contribute to the UK's urgent requirement for the delivery of new renewable energy generation capacity and infrastructure. The Secretary of State will need to balance impacts and changes against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in Government policy. The Applicant has committed to mitigating impacts wherever possible, and the impacts to the environment and economy have been carefully evaluated by technical assessments.
RR-213, RR-265	Policy Accordance – NPPF	The proposed site is in one of the most celebrated rural viewpoints in Lincolnshire - a location that draws walkers, visitors, and	The effects on landscape components and character during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development are assessed in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
		photographers from far and wide as part of the Viking Way National Trail. The uninterrupted view across the Trent Valley from various viewpoints within Navenby, Coleby and surrounding villages and the Viking Way is one of the defining features of the areas landscape character and that of the National Trail. The industrialisation of this setting through the installation of a solar farm and battery storage facility would cause irreversible visual harm to a highly valued landscape and contradicts the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF para 174), which seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment. The impacted area has areas and villages designated a conservation area with a rich historic character, containing a significant number of listed buildings and heritage assets. The visual intrusion and industrial nature of the proposed development would compromise the setting of these heritage assets and conflict with local and national heritage policies, including those set out in the NPPF. Loss of Productive Farmland: The site consists of valuable agricultural land that contributes to local and national food production. Converting it for industrial use contradicts planning policy (NPPF Paragraph 174) which seeks to protect the “best and most versatile” farmland. Solar farms should be located on brownfield sites, rooftops, or low-grade land instead.	Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The Proposed Development would result in 17 significant adverse landscape and visual effects at construction, operation and decommissioning. While these are temporary and reversible on decommissioning, it is noted that 5 residual significant effects would remain after year 15 of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development. It must be acknowledged that in the case of the Proposed Development, the landscape is not protected and that while not eliminated, the landscape and visual effects have been minimised and would reduce over time as mitigation planting matures. As set out in Appendix 10-G: Landscape and Visual Amenity Study Area Analysis of the ES **[APP- 154]**, views were assessed from several points along the Viking Way. In summary: • WA1 View from Viking Way (Wdgn 5/2), west of Mettam Road - Residents and users of the Viking Way currently experience very limited views of the Order Limits over 5km away. People in this location are unlikely to experience any changes as a result of the Proposed Development due to the relative distance and intervening vegetation within the vales. • NA3 View from Viking Way (Nave 6/1), northwest of Navenby - Residents of Navenby experience partial views of the Order Limits in the far background. People in this location are unlikely to experience any changes as a result of the Proposed Development due to the relative distance and intervening vegetation within the vales. • NA4 View from Viking Way (Wlgr 6/1), west of Wellingore - Residents of Wellingore experience partial views of the Order Limits in the far background. People in this location are unlikely to experience any changes as a result of the Proposed Development due to the relative distance and intervening vegetation within the vales. While the Principal Site will be used for solar energy generation, the land will not, in planning terms, be permanently changed to industrial land use. The Proposed Development comprises a temporary installation and at the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, the infrastructure will be removed, and the land returned to landowners in accordance with the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, a detailed version of which, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The decommissioning process will enable the majority of the Principal Site to be returned to the landowners, available for its original use, with the only areas of agricultural land considered to be permanently lost due to the Proposed Development being areas of planting and habitat creation introduced as part of the Proposed Development in the event these are not removed as part of the decommissioning works. Although the expectation is that the land will be returned to its current use upon decommissioning, this will be at the discretion of the landowners. Whilst there are no Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, or other designated heritage assets located within the Order Limits, as reported in Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage of the ES **[APP-032]**, it is acknowledged that within 3km of the Order Limits there are 123 designated heritage assets. This comprises five Scheduled Monuments, 114 listed buildings (seven grade I, six grade II* and 101 grade II), three conservation areas, and one grade II registered park and garden. As set out in the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, the Proposed Development would lead to less than substantial harm (at the lower end of the scale) to two designated heritage assets and one non-designated heritage asset. However, it has been demonstrated that the substantial benefits of the Proposed Development outweigh the harm to these assets and as a result, the Proposed Development is in accordance with paragraph 5.9.32 of NPS EN-1 which states “Where the proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Planning Policy
			the public benefits of the proposal". It should be noted that the effects would be both temporary and reversible, albeit long term. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF (referred to in the Relevant Representation) sets out *"the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test".* As described in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, it has been concluded that the location of the Proposed Development comprises the preferred site when compared with other potential alternative sites and taking into account planning and environmental constraints and operational considerations. Planning policy recognises the importance, for agriculture, of BMV land, which is Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grades 1, 2, and Subgrade 3a. The land contained within the Principal Site is comprised primarily of ALC Grade 3b with some occurrences of ALC grade 3a. There is no ALC Grade 1 or ALC Grade 2 land within the Principal Site. Soil surveys have been undertaken for the Principal Site, with results published in Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report **[APP-161]** of the ES. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. These land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. As set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.

7.12 General Public: Site Selection

Table 7-12: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection
RR-004, RR-008, RR-010, RR-011, RR-012, RR-020, RR-027, RR-029, RR-030, RR-036, RR-044, RR-048, RR-057, RR-059, RR-069, RR-075, RR-076, RR-081, RR-083, RR-087, RR-092, RR-093, RR-103, RR-110, RR-112, RR-113, RR-114, RR-120, RR-129, RR-136, RR-142, RR-144, RR-148, RR-153, RR-155, RR-171, RR-172, RR-174, RR-175, RR-177, RR-206, RR-216, RR-222, RR-230, RR-231, RR-232, RR-239, RR-244, RR-246, RR-248, RR-249, RR-253, RR-259, RR-267, RR-281, RR-284, RR-289, RR-290, RR-291	Size, Scale and Location of the Proposed Development	The Proposed Development covers a vast area, encompassing land in close proximity to a number of villages, and has been described as "colossal" and "disproportionate". As a county, Lincolnshire is being disproportionately "targeted" by proposals similar to the Proposed Development. The inclusion of the Cable Corridor effectively extends the footprint of the Proposed Development across a wide area, representing a continuous zone of disruption over 10km. I cannot believe that anyone would put a site like this huge battery storage unit so close to a village never mind so close to houses. Such developments should be at least 2 miles away from built up areas.	As set out in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Proposed Development will, if consented, provide an essential contribution to meeting the governmental objectives of delivering utility-scale infrastructure to enable decarbonisation. By doing so, the Proposed Development will address the climate emergency that affects everyone's lives and the environment, by ensuring the UK's energy supply is secure, low-carbon and low-cost. As explained, in Section 3.4 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. a site of approximately 1,000 hectares is required to deliver the Proposed Development, which would comprise land required for solar infrastructure which includes solar panels, battery storage and on site substation etc and land for environmental mitigation. The ability to retain flexibility and to achieve a balance between landowner requests to include more land to avoid them being left with smaller areas of land that would not be viable for other uses, whilst also ensuring that landowners are left with sufficient land to ensure that farming practices remain practical and workable in the long term were also considerations informing site size. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. concludes that the location of the Proposed Development comprises a suitable site, taking into account planning and environmental constraints and operational considerations. It is understood there are other developments coming forward in the surrounding area. These are discussed in Section 3.4 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** and Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions of the ES **[APP-040]** addresses the potential for Cumulative Effects and Effect Interactions as a result of the Proposed Development. It is acknowledged that the Cable Corridor may seem extensive at approximately 351 ha. However, this is to retain flexibility, and once constructed, the cable itself will comprise a smaller fraction of this. With regards to BESS, the Proposed Development does include the flexibility at this stage for a centralised or distributed BESS. BESS is an important component of the transition to net zero and providing flexibility to the energy system. The BESS has a direct relationship with the Proposed Development and will support its operation by storing energy when it is generated in abundance and releasing it to the grid when it is needed, increasing the reliability of the energy system and contributing to the security of supply more generally. Design Principle 11 in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** sets out that the Proposed Development will ensure that battery safety is managed through appropriate siting away from sensitive receptors and ensuring the inclusion of embedded design mitigation measures to minimise risks. This Principle has led to a Design Commitment, which will be secured under Requirement 6 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This is Design Commitment BA1 which states that the centralised BESS will be sited a minimum of 200m from residential receptors. The design of the Proposed Development includes integrated mitigation and protection measures are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. The BESS layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. The provision of a detailed BSMP is secured under Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and will be substantially in accordance with the framework. Under this Requirement, the detailed BSMP must be approved

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection
			by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with LFRS, and the BSMP must be implemented as approved.
RR-001, RR-010, RR-012, RR-013, RR-015, RR-029, RR-033, RR-036, RR-042, RR-048, RR-059, RR-075, RR-087, RR-094, RR-103, RR-113, RR-120, RR-128, RR-130, RR-141, RR-145, RR-148, RR-160, RR-161, RR-166, RR-170, RR-172, RR-174, RR-182, RR-188, RR-191, RR-192, RR-206, RR-209, RR-213, RR-222, RR-223, RR-226, RR-228, RR-229, RR-236, RR-244, RR-250, RR-252, RR-265, RR-267, RR-274, RR-276, RR-277, RR-284, RR-290	Insufficient Consideration of Alternatives	The Applicant has failed to investigate alternatives, and has given insufficient consideration to this possibility. There has been inadequate consideration of alternative routes for the Cable Corridor, and inadequate consideration of existing grid connections closer to Lincoln or other substations. The Applicant has not provided a transparent explanation of why existing or shorter connection points were ruled out.	Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** describes the consideration of alternatives and the design evolution of the Proposed Development. This concludes there were no alternative technologies or sites studied by the Applicant that could deliver the Design Vision for the Proposed Development. This is in line with paragraph 4.3.15 of NPS EN-1 which states that applicants are obliged to include in their ES information about the reasonable alternatives that have been studied, indicating the main reasons for the applicant's choice and taking into account the environmental, social and economic effects and including, where relevant, technical and commercial feasibility. In terms of alternative cable corridors, a full explanation of the Alternative Cable Corridors considered is provided in Section 4.7 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**. The Grid Connection Statement **[APP-200]** confirms that the Applicant has secured a connection to the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. In terms of site selection, as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, the first stage of assessment is the identification of an area of search, based on the point of connection. The need for an available connection with appropriate capacity is essential to deliver a large-scale solar development. This is set out in paragraph 2.10.24 of NPS EN-3 which recognises that *"…the connection voltage, availability of network capacity, and the distance from the solar farm to the existing network can have a significant effect on the commercial feasibility of a development proposal*." The identification of the site for the Proposed Development was driven by the availability of deliverable land and site suitability in accordance with policy requirements. Following a formal application to National Grid for a connection into the 400kV Overhead Line at Whisby, the Applicant was informed that this point of connection was not available and was instead offered, and subsequently secured, a point of connection at the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out the approach to assessing the suitability of the site for the Proposed Development and potential alternative sites against a range of planning, environmental and operational criteria for generating stations with capacity of more than 50MW. The report concludes that the location of the Proposed Development comprises a suitable site taking into account planning and environmental constraints and operational considerations.
RR-008, RR-020, RR-022, RR-029, RR-033, RR-055, RR-056, RR-075, RR-087, RR-108, RR-110, RR-120, RR-139, RR-147, RR-152, RR-169, RR-188, RR-213, RR-222, RR-229, RR-231, RR-233, RR-238, RR-249, RR-250, RR-259, RR-263, RR-281, RR-284, RR-290	Inadequate Justification for Site Selection	Why is such a project being considered in a rural community? Has a deal already been made without consultation? The Applicant has not provided clear justification for why this particular alignment is necessary or optimal. In particular, the Cable Corridor appears to have been selected for convenience, rather than as a result of rigorous environmental or technical comparison.	A full assessment of the site selection process is provided in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. It concludes that the location of the Proposed Development comprises a suitable site when compared with other potential alternative sites and taking into account planning and environmental constraints and operational considerations. Consultation on the Proposed Development was ongoing throughout the design process prior to submission, as detailed in the Consultation Report **[APP-023]** and Consultation Report Appendices **[APP-024]**.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection
			The Alternative Cable Corridors considered are set discussed in Section 4.7 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**. The Cable Corridor has been refined from three options to one over the course of the Proposed Development design. This refinement came from the assessment of planning (e.g. site allocations, planning applications and minerals safeguarding areas), environmental (e.g. listed buildings, ecological designations and areas of woodland) and physical constraints (e.g. rivers, transport infrastructure and public rights of way). Overall, the central grid connection corridor presented the favoured route based on the environmental information available. The central grid connection corridor created a relatively direct route that was largely through low-risk areas. The next stage of the analysis considered land ownership information for the potential grid connection corridor options with the aim of minimising the number of landowners and the number of parcels affected by the corridor. Based on this analysis, the central grid connection corridor was preferred.
RR-009, RR-010, RR-012, RR-014, RR-015, RR-027, RR-029, RR-033, RR-044, RR-055, RR-056, RR-059, RR-067, RR-075, RR-081, RR-083, RR-084, RR-094, RR-095, RR-096, RR-101, RR-103, RR-108, RR-110, RR-113, RR-124, RR-128, RR-130, RR-132 RR-139, RR-144, RR-145, RR-147, RR-148, RR-149, RR-150, RR-152 RR-161, RR-166, RR-168, RR-169, RR-172, RR-174, RR-186, RR-188, RR-191, RR-192, RR-206, RR-209, RR-213, RR-215, RR-218, RR-220, RR-222, RR-224, RR-226, RR-230, RR-232, RR-233, RR-234, RR-236, RR-244, RR-247, RR-249, RR-250, RR-253, RR-254, RR-257, RR-262, RR-263, RR-265, RR-267, RR-274, RR-276, RR-281, RR-277, RR-281, RR-284, RR-290	Preference for Alternative Sites for Solar Panels	Respondents have expressed strong opinions that alternative sites should be used for projects such as the Proposed Development. There is a strong preference for the use of rooftop solar on both residential and commercial premises, or siting solar panels on brownfield, industrial and low/medium grade agricultural land. Other suggested sites for solar panels include, railway lines, motorways, car parks, schools, hospitals, supermarkets, undeveloped MOD land and sport stadiums.	As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that alternatives such as decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in NPS EN-1 that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to the adequate and dependable energy generation mix required to meet the energy security and decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of NPS EN-3 states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of a site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. As demonstrated in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, these land types were identified within the area of search by reviewing the relevant brownfield land registers and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby.
RR-015, RR-033, RR-092, RR-113, RR-147, RR-172, RR-192, RR-222, RR-239	Lack of Available Grid Connection	The proposal does not seek to use existing grid connection capacity. Since it is not in close proximity to existing grid infrastructure, the Proposed Development looks to link to the proposed new National Grid Substation near Navenby which has not even been submitted to NKDC (so there is no grid connection). The Proposed Development would be at least 10 miles away from this connection to the National Grid. In terms of the site selection process, why was a 15km radius of the proposed Navenby substation set? National Grid have a number of agreed and proposed substations in the country, many with easy access to brownfield sites; why were these not considered?	Whilst permission for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby has not been granted, at the time of writing the application is due to be submitted to NKDC in early 2026, with a decision anticipated in Spring 2026 according to the National Grid website for the project. Section 3 of NPS EN-1 sets out that the government sees a need for significant amounts of new large-scale energy infrastructure to meet its energy objectives and details why the government considers that the need for such infrastructure is urgent. Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** sets out the methodology adopted for the site selection process. Following a formal application to National Grid for a connection into the 400kV Overhead Line at Whisby, the Applicant was informed that this point of connection was not available and was instead offered and subsequently secured a point of connection at the

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection
			proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. Having secured land with willing landowners, and in recognition of the need to consider reasonable alternatives, the Applicant sought to assess the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints. As set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, a 15km area of search was identified which the Applicant considered to be a viable maximum distance from the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby for a project of this scale. This took into account the cost of the infrastructure and construction and the preference to limit the extent of environmental impacts and disruption which increase as the length of the cable corridor does. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant has sought to identify a suitable site that is as least environmentally constrained as possible. Additionally, the Applicant sought to reduce the need for the use of Compulsory Acquisition powers, meaning that the availability of landowners willing to lease land for the Proposed Development was an important consideration. Taking account of the suitability of the location for solar infrastructure, the availability of a network connection, appraisal of planning and environmental constraints and willing landowners, the Order Limits was selected to be taken forward for the Proposed Development. Following site selection, and through the process of design evolution, the Applicant has sought to minimise impacts wherever possible
RR-139, RR-263	Proposed Development Prompting Need for Navenby Substation	The location of the solar farm is prompting the requirement for a large new substation at Navenby and there is no obvious suggestion that consideration has been given to utilising existing HV facilities close to Newark, e.g., the existing large gas fired power station and infrastructure. Though this would require longer runs of HV cables (approximately 5 to 10 km) and any additional costs would be offset by the capital costs for the new substation.	As stated on their website, National Grid is bringing forward the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby alongside the Great Grid Upgrade which seeks to upgrade the grid in order to connect homes, businesses and public services to sources of home-grown renewable energy in order to lower electricity bills and make the UK more energy secure. National Grid state on their website that based on current demand around Navenby, it is not possible to connect everything proposed in the area to existing regional substations such as Bicker Fen. To connect new developments to the network, they have identified that a new 400 kilovolt (kV) substation is needed but it should be made clear that, whilst the Proposed Development will connect into Navenby, it is not driving the Navenby substation development. As set out in Section 2.3 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, following a review of available capacity in the transmission network, the Applicant identified a line in and line out connection into the 400kV Overhead Line close to Whisby Hall. A desk top review of the site to consider planning and environmental constraints, concluded that the site was viable, and accordingly, a formal application was made to National Grid for a connection into the 400kV Overhead Line. However, National Grid informed the Applicant that this point of connection (POC) was not available and instead was offered and subsequently secured a POC at the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby, which was a location capable of serving multiple customers, including the Applicant. Therefore, as demonstrated, the Applicant considered existing points of connection prior to securing a connection at the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby.
RR-027, RR-028, RR-033, RR-092, RR-172	No Existing Grid Connection	There is no existing grid connection. The proposed development is intended to connect to the proposed Navenby substation in respect of which there is no planning permission. The proposed development is not capable of being brought into operation unless planning	The Proposed Development is due to connect to the national electricity transmission network at the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. Whilst the Proposed Development will connect into the Navenby substation, which does not yet have planning consent and has not been constructed, this is not a barrier to the granting of

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection
		permission is granted for the Navenby substation and NGET proceeds with the construction of the substation.	development consent if there are no obvious reasons for the other application not to be granted consent. For example, paragraph 4.11.8 of NPS EN-1 sets out that "*on some occasions it may not be possible to coordinate applications. For example, different elements of a project may have different lead-in times and be undertaken by different legal entities subject to different commercial and regulatory frameworks (for example grid companies operate within OFGEM controls) making it inefficient from a delivery perspective to submit one application. Applicants may therefore decide to submit separate applications for each element. Where this is the case, the applicant should include information on the other elements and explain the reasons for the separate application confirming that there are no obvious reasons for why other elements are likely to be refused*". As stated, the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby does not form part of this Application. A planning application for the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby will be submitted to NKDC by National Grid and will be determined in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Given the generally supportive national and local policy position, and on the basis that National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) take a responsible approach to siting, design and mitigation, in compliance with the 'Horlock Rules', there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant why planning permission for the Navenby substation and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would not be granted. NGET has stated to the Applicant that should consent not be granted the fall back is to appeal any such refusal to the Secretary of State and await determination.
RR-222	Site Selection Process	The Applicant states "A smaller scheme would not deliver the same generation capacity or energy security and climate change benefit as the Proposed Development and, as such, would not represent a reasonable alternative." Two smaller schemes, for example, could generate the same capacity; this is solely about the Applicant having found willing landowners and therefore maximising significant adverse impact in order to maximise profit. "This SSR **[Site Selection Report]** sets out the approach to assessing the suitability of the site for the Proposed Development with potential alternative sites against a range of planning, environmental and operational criteria for a generating station with capacity of more than 50MW." So the Applicant's own criteria sets a minimum generating capacity of 50MW; therefore any potential alternatives above 50MW, including options on the chosen site, should have been considered.	As set out in Section 2.3 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of this Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, large areas of contiguous land are ideal for large-scale solar development as they can be joined together as a single development. This is reflected in the substantial landholding secured at Morton Manor and Housham Grange. Large areas of contiguous land reduces the need for cabling through third party land, thus increasing viability and deliverability and reducing environmental impacts, such as less vegetation removal which reduces impacts on hedgerows and trees. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of this Planning Statement **[AS-098]** also sets out that the Applicant's preference was to deliver the Proposed Development on as few land parcels, with as few landowners, as possible, to ensure the deliverability of the Proposed Development. Section 3.6 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of this Planning Statement **[AS-098]** describes how the availability of willing landowners is an important consideration in order to assemble a site that is deliverable and meet the policy requirements in relation to compulsory acquisition. The availability of willing landowners reduces and potentially avoids the need for Compulsory Acquisition powers to be used. A full explanation of site selection is set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of this Planning Statement **[AS-098]**. The report concludes that the location of the Proposed Development comprises a suitable site taking into account planning and environmental constraints and operational considerations. In relation to generating capacity, the reference to 50 MW aligns with the definition of the Proposed Development as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) pursuant to s14(1)(a), s15(1) and s15(2) of the Planning Act 2008, as it comprises an onshore generating station in England with a capacity exceeding 50 MW.
RR-222	Suggestion of Alternative in the Area	The Applicant refers to ground-mounted solar, small scale solar, and domestic rooftop installations. The glaring omission is the vast acreage of commercial roof space in the UK; less than 10km away	With regards to exploring the scope to utilise rooftops and non-agricultural land (such as brownfield sites) for development, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. Commercial rooftops do

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection
		from the proposed site near Newark there are many recently erected very large warehouses, why has the Applicant not considered this option?	present an opportunity for solar development but not at the scale of the Proposed Development, which would require vastly more rooftops than are available within the site selection area of search. When trying to develop at the scale and the speed which has been targeted by the Government, commercial and industrial rooftops present a number of challenges, for example; a) not all rooftops are structurally sound to take solar panels; b) the electrical infrastructure in a commercial building may hamper the scale of deployment on a particular building, for example, an unrefrigerated warehouse such as a distribution centre likely has a very large area available but as this type of building has relatively low power, the infrastructure would not be capable of accommodating the power flow from the whole roof, limiting deployment; c) Given a commercial building is often owned by a commercial property developer and leased to a tenant, complex ownership structures exist when proposing developments of this nature. Timescales for negotiating agreements for every individual site are long and given the number that would be required for a scheme delivering the level of generation of the Proposed Development, this will likely hinder the speed of deployment and therefore the cost saving of deploying at scale, which in turn increases the cost of energy that the Proposed Development would be able to deliver. d) government targets also include a proportion of rooftop solar therefore deployment of rooftops such as the area around Newark are needed, as well as the deployment of schemes such as the Proposed Development. It should also be noted that the urban area of Newark is outside of the site selection area of search as shown on Figure 1 of the Site Selection Report at Annex A of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**.
RR-172	Inappropriate Area due to Lack of Grid Connection	Navenby village has no link to the grid. Yet within 10km, connected to a city-sized 10,000 acres of best farmland in the world is being taken, along with a huge sub-station, four battery storage sites, each up to 1,324 shipping containers full of Lithium batteries, near homes and schools, with pitiful regulation.	The Grid Connection Statement **[APP-200]** confirms that the Applicant has secured a connection to the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. Whilst it is acknowledged there is no planning permission for the proposed substation at the time of writing, given the generally supportive national and local policy position, and on the basis that National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) take a responsible approach to siting, design and mitigation, in compliance with the 'Horlock Rules', there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant why planning permission for the Navenby substation and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would not be granted. NGET has stated to the Applicant that should consent not be granted the fall back is to appeal any such refusal to the Secretary of State and await determination. The use of agricultural land, including BMV land, has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. Planning policy recognises the importance, for agriculture, of BMV land, which is Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grades 1, 2, and Subgrade 3a. The land contained within the Principal Site is comprised primarily of ALC Grade 3b with some occurrences of ALC grade 3a. There is no ALC Grade 1 or ALC Grade 2 land within the Principal Site.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Site Selection
			In relation to the batteries, the existing and draft NFCC guidance (July 2024 revision) has been incorporated into the design and safety of the Proposed Development, which is explained in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. Furthermore, the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** provides a commitment at paragraph 1.2.8 that the BESS will be designed in accordance with the UK and internationally recognised good practice guidance available at the time. A detailed BSMP will be secured by Requirement 7 under Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-103	Proximity to Connection	BESS sites should be on brownfield sites, of which there are many, with access to existing overhead power lines, thereby avoiding the need for connection corridors.	BESS is an important component of the transition to net zero and providing flexibility to the energy system, as recognised in paragraphs 3.3.25 to 3.3.27 of NPS EN-1. The BESS has a direct relationship with the Proposed Development and will support its operation by storing energy when it is generated in abundance and releasing it to the grid when it is needed, increasing the reliability of the energy system and contributing to the security of supply. This increases the efficiency of the Proposed Development as a renewable energy project aiding both its operation as a generation station and the export of electricity to the grid.
RR-134	Speculative Nature of Application	This is a speculative application as there is currently nowhere for the output of this project to go to.	The Grid Connection Statement **[APP-200]** confirms the Applicant submitted an application for and subsequently received a grid connection offer from National Grid Electricity System Operator Limited (NESO) to connect the Proposed Development to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) at the proposed National Grid substation near Navenby. Whilst it is acknowledged there is no planning permission for the proposed substation at the time of writing, given the generally supportive national and local policy position, and on the basis that National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) take a responsible approach to siting, design and mitigation, in compliance with the 'Horlock Rules', there are no obvious reasons known to the Applicant why planning permission for the Navenby substation and associated overhead lines to connect it into the national grid would be withheld. NGET has stated to the Applicant that should consent not be granted the fall back is to appeal any such refusal to the Secretary of State and await determination.
RR-147	Wrong Location for Such a Project	Whilst supporting a clean energy future, I believe that this project is in the wrong place and contrary to everything we hear the government saying about both, re-use of land and working with communities.	Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[APP-098]** concludes that the location of the Proposed Development comprises a suitable site when compared with other potential alternative sites and taking into account planning and environmental constraints and operational considerations. The design presented at Application stage represents the outcome of several design iterations, including feedback from Non-Statutory and Statutory Consultation, ongoing technical engagement with stakeholders, discussions with landowners and the outcomes of environmental assessment.

7.13 General Public: Proposed Development Design

Table 7-13: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design
RR-139, RR-263	Quantity of Solar Panels	Could it be made clear in terms the actual quantity of solar panels that will be installed – a figure of 50-70,000 has been suggested?	The exact number of solar panels will be confirmed during the detailed design stage, whereby flexibility is retained in the Proposed Development design relating to factors such as the type and dimensions of panels, which would affect the overall total number of panels. However, based on Figure 3-2A: Indicative Fixed South Facing Layout Plan of the ES **[AS-022]** the Proposed Development would comprise approximately 569,000 solar panels in the fixed south facing orientation. Based on Figure 3-2B: Indicative Single Axis Tracker Site Layout Plan of the ES **[AS-023]** the Proposed Development would comprise approximately 476,000 solar panels in the single access tracker formation.
RR-068	Use of Unreliable Technology	This is another project designed around using unregulated technology that is unstable and unproven and unreliable.	The Proposed Development will be designed and built in accordance with all relevant British Standards, applicable regulations and industry best-practice. The Applicant disagrees that the technology is unstable, unproven and unreliable – modern solar panels can generate power when levels of irradiation are lower, and technology continues to improve, making solar energy a reliable and valuable energy source in the region. The Applicant is satisfied with the proposed technology and will procure modern technology which has a guaranteed minimum return through a manufacturer warranty. Furthermore, by co-locating battery energy storage systems (BESS) with solar PV, the benefits of the renewable energy generated by the Proposed Development are maximised. BESS enables time-shifting of solar output, absorbing energy when generation exceeds demand and discharging it during system peaks in demand. This reduces curtailment, increases utilisation of solar capacity, and can provide ancillary services to the power grid. Further information is provided in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. With regards to the implementation of solar technology more generally, NPS EN-3 recognises solar as a Critical National Priority, and explains that projects such as the Proposed Development and this DCO Application are required to meet the United Kingdom's Net Zero Targets. Solar forms an important part of a diverse portfolio of energy generating facilities that are required in the UK; which is recognised in NPS EN-1. It should be noted that the design of the Proposed Development and DCO application has maintained a level of flexibility, for example in relation to solar panel type/design; this approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. As such, the design is futureproofed and able to adapt to any relevant technological advancements, such as more efficient solar panels, during the detailed design stage.
RR-027, RR-095, RR-192, RR-228, RR-245, RR-273, RR-276	Outdated Technology	Concerns regarding the current pace of technological advancements meaning that these solar panels will soon be outdated technology. Some Respondents state that this form of solar generation is already out of date and now obsolescent as advancements already supersede what is being proposed. The duration of the operation at 60 years is unjustified and unrealistic in terms of technological developments. A 60 year lifetime is incompatible with durability and technology obsolescence.	The design of the Proposed Development and the DCO application has deliberately retained a degree of flexibility, for example in relation to the type and design of solar panels. This approach is typical for developments of this nature, as solar PV technologies continue to evolve and efficiencies are developed. Maintaining this flexibility ensures that the design is future-proofed and able to incorporate relevant technological advancements, such as more efficient solar panels, during the detailed design stage. The 60-year lifetime is considered appropriate for the Proposed Development and aligns with other consented solar projects, whereby the 60-year lifetime of the Proposed Development will provide urgently needed low-carbon renewable electricity and be a critical part of the national portfolio of renewable energy generation that is required to decarbonise its energy supply quickly

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design
			and contribute to the transition to net zero. During the anticipated 60-year design life of the Proposed Development, it is expected that there will be requirement for the periodic replacement of some or all of the electrical infrastructure (details regarding the replacement of solar PV panels and BESS area within the Proposed Development is presented in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development **[APP-028]** (ref. Section 3.5)). The ability to replace panels, where it is economical and practical to do so, part way through the lifetime of the Proposed Development allows for the implementation of any advancements in the technology to maximise the renewable generation onsite.
RR-131, RR-166, RR-218, RR-238	Lack of Well Thought Out Design	Battery storage has not been thought out. Concern that electricity will be sent via pylons which will also ruin the countryside but the cost of placing cables underground would mean the whole project would be economical Assuming the development goes ahead, it is not clear how the cable will be carried across the land. Suggestion has been made that it will be underground, (which is the preferred option of residents) but it does not rule out pylons. Pylons would not be welcome and would create a huge eyesore to all the surrounding villages.	The Applicant considers that the BESS has been thoroughly and appropriately designed, with the design developed in consultation with LFRS, taking account of guidance from the NFCC, as set out in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. There will be no overhead lines or pylons as part of the Proposed Development or Cable Corridor; these do not form part of the authorised development that is being applied for (Schedule 1 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). All cables for onsite connections and grid export will be buried underground. The only above ground cables are those that may be attached to the rear of panels. The undergrounding of the cables is included within the relevant Work No.s of the Proposed Development Parameters **[APP-187]** – this is secured by Requirement 6 Detailed design approval of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-230	Short Term Nature of Project Design	The short term nature of these projects (40yrs) and the cost (financial and environmentally) to get there and then deconstruct at the end.	Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, the land would be returned to landowners and available for its current use. Any material change of use would be at landowner discretion, though planning permission would be required. The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** submitted with the DCO Application sets out the principles and measures to be followed in the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. This provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This ensures that the decommissioning works will be undertaken in line with the measures secured within the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**.
RR-213	Short Commercial Life Span	Of particular concern is the relatively short commercial lifespan of the site; given the major disruption and scarring to the local area it is difficult to justify the development when weighed against a functional lifespan that is essential temporary in planning terms. Once decommissioned, the site will require further intervention to remove hazardous components, restore land, and possibly reconfigure surrounding infrastructure again - thereby compounding the long-term impact on the community and countryside. Furthermore, this kind of development introduces a precedent for short-term, high-impact infrastructure projects that do not provide enduring benefits to the local area or indeed nationally. In contrast, truly sustainable development should deliver long-term environmental and community value, not just short-term commercial gain.	The Secretary of State will need to balance impacts and changes against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in Government policy. The Applicant has committed to mitigating impacts wherever possible, and the impacts to the environment and economy have been carefully evaluated by technical assessments. With regards to decommissioning, the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** submitted with the DCO Application sets out the principles and measures to be followed in the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. This includes best practice avoidance and mitigation measures relating to ground conditions and contamination to be applied (ref. GC-D1). The development of a detailed DEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2to the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.This ensures that the decommissioning works will be undertaken in line with the measures secured within the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design
			The Applicant recognises the need for proposals to deliver long-term environmental and community value. This has been thoroughly considered throughout the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development, with input from the local community shaping the final design of the Proposed Development. For example, the proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]** to maximise community benefits, providing more effective linkages across the site. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 6.1.4), to be secured by Requirement 8 and Requirement 17 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, a permissive path network, totalling approximately 9.5km, will be implemented providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits (see Figure 3-3 Proposed Permissive Path Plan of the ES **[AS-024]** and the Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** for further details). Furthermore, should the Proposed Development be granted consent, the Applicant will provide a community benefit fund providing a sum of per MW per year of export capacity. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO Application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community benefit fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. One way of doing this is by appointing a community foundation which would independently manage the fund, using their local knowledge to identify funding opportunities and help maximise benefits for local communities. A community benefit fund would only operate if the Proposed Development received development consent. To maximise the economic benefits to the local community the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to skills, supply chain and employment which the Applicant could take forward post-consent. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** also outlines the Applicant's intentions to engage with local schools, local further education providers, local higher education providers. The Applicant recognises that the Proposed Development can assist academic research by linking with local Universities and provide local schools with learning opportunities. Furthermore, the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** provides a structure for delivering ways under which local community members can put forward their ideas and the Proposed Development can then maximise local benefits. The provision of a detailed ESSCP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured by Requirement 19 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Other wider benefits are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including energy security, decarbonisation, ecological enhancements (including significant biodiversity net gain), employment generation and economic benefits.
RR-015	Insufficient Mitigation	I contend that the applicants have paid insufficient attention to designing a scheme that seeks to minimise and mitigate against these harmful impacts on the local landscape and settlements. Much more could have been done to:	In its pursuit of securing good design, the Applicant has sought to minimise landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development, as set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. The provision of visual screening, for example for residents and users of PRoW, has been considered throughout the design of the landscaping proposals, as illustrated in the Landscape Mitigation Plan presented in Figure 7.15-1 within the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, whereby (as noted in paragraph 4.1.4) the overall goal of the landscape strategy is to integrate the Proposed

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design
		- Site the solar panel arrays on less visible fields, further ways from roads and footpaths; - Screen the solar panels with more extensive planting, banking and landscaping, and deeper buffer zones; - Site the proposed BESS in a less visible location, or incorporate a series of smaller BESS installations across the development, as was being considered at one stage. In the context of Bassingham: - The solar panels to the east of Clay Lane will be highly visible from the houses on the western boundary of the village; the churchyard riverbank area; Church Bridge; the footpaths through the field to the west of the village; and the Holmes Parish Woodland; - The solar panels and security fe ncing along the western edge of Clay Lane through to Norton Disney will be clearly seen; - The solar panels to the north of Fen Lane will be visually intrusive; - The solar panels and BESS to the south of Aubourn will be clearly visible from the road. I believe that all of these negative impacts on the landscape could have been reduced through a more carefully designed scheme. The scheme is not well designed with insufficient focus on minimising its harmful impacts on the rural landscape	Development into its surrounding landscape and to avoid or minimise adverse landscape and visual effects as much as possible. As noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraphs 4.1.8 – 4.1.13), all solar PV panels and associated infrastructure have been sited within the existing field pattern, protecting existing vegetation, and maximising the natural screening provided by field boundary vegetation which will be supplemented with additional planting. The solar PV panels and associated infrastructure have been sited to preserve, as far as possible, cross valley views from Thorpe-on-the-Hill and important views towards Lincoln Cathedral from Tunman Hill. Larger infrastructure, such as the Onsite Substation and BESS Compound, have been located within areas of enclosed landscape, bound by frequent small woodlands and hedgerows, to minimise potential visual effects. Offsets (typically measuring in excess of 100m) from settlement boundaries and new planting have been incorporated to retain a sense of openness whilst screening the solar PV arrays from surrounding settlements. The Principal Site mostly avoids land adjacent to the local road network to minimise the visual impact on people travelling. Where this has not been possible, bespoke offsets (measuring a minimum of 20m) and mitigation planting have been incorporated. The siting of solar PV panels and associated infrastructure seeks to minimise instances of development on both sides of PRoW. Where components of the Proposed Development are proposed adjacent to a PRoW, an offset of a minimum of 10m from the centre line has been incorporated, as per the Design Commitments set out in the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**. Where components of the Proposed Development are proposed on both sides of a PRoW, these minimum commitments still apply (i.e. the provision of a minimum of 10m from the centreline either side of the PRoW), although sections of wider offsets have also been integrated to vary the extent of views experienced across the Principal Site where practicable. New and enhanced hedgerows have also been proposed to provide screening where appropriate. The detailed design of the Proposed Development must be in accordance with the Design Commitments, as secured by Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse effects on the landscape character and visual amenity resulting from the Proposed Development, as detailed within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, but considers that these would predominantly be in the short to medium term during construction and the early years of operation of the Proposed Development. There are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on residents of local villages as, by year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping (see the Landscape Mitigation Plan provided in Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) would have matured such that views of solar PV infrastructure within the Order Limits would be screened. Photomontages (see ES Figure 10-10 Photomontages **[APP-097] [AS-119]**) have been prepared to inform the visual assessment undertaken in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]** - these photomontages demonstrate how the visual impact at relevant receptors reduces over time as the proposed landscaping matures. It should be noted that the Applicant has committed to a minimum offset of 50m of all solar infrastructure, a minimum buffer of 200m from the centralised BESS and 150m from the distributed BESS to residential receptors to minimise impacts to their visual amenity. These commitments are set out in the Design Commitments within the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** and in paragraph 2.3.5 of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (relating to the BES offset commitments), which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The detailed design of the Proposed Development must be in accordance with the Design Commitments, as secured by Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design

[APP-016]. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is to be developed into a detailed BSMP, substantially in accordance with the Framework Plan, secured under Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some adverse effects on the landscape character and visual amenity resulting from the Proposed Development, as detailed within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**, but considers that these would predominantly be in the short to medium term during construction and the early years of operation. There are no significant long term visual effects anticipated on residents of local villages as, by year 15 of operation, the proposed landscaping (see the Landscape Mitigation Plan provided in Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**) would have matured such that views of solar PV infrastructure within the Site would be screened. The provision of a detailed LEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. When determining the DCO Application, the Secretary of State will need to balance the landscape and visual impacts against the urgent need and critical national priority for the Proposed Development as set out in the NPS for Energy.

Regarding the siting of the centralised BESS, the proposed location (as per the Works Plans **[AS-105]**) benefits from the woodland immediately adjoining to the north (outside of the Order Limits) which provides screening from Aubourn. With regards to the comment of incorporating a series of smaller BESS installations across the development, it should be noted that the design of the Proposed Development retains the option of a distributed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) arrangement, as discussed in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development of the ES **[APP-028]** (ref. paragraph 3.3.34). The decision as to whether a centralised BESS or a distributed BESS arrangement is taken forward will be made post-consent, as part of the detailed design process.

Regarding the potential impact of the Proposed Development in the context of the locations noted in the comment:

- Regarding the potential impact upon the western extent of Bassingham, Viewpoint 22 (see Figure 10-7 Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Barrier Earth, with Viewpoint Locations of the ES **[AS-059]**), as assessed in Appendix 10-F: Visual Assessment of the ES **[AS-120]** (ref. Table 17), considers the potential visual impact of the Proposed Development on the residents of Bassingham. The assessment notes that there are glimpsed views across flat, arable fields available through the gaps in intervening vegetation within the back gardens and along the River Witham. The assessment establishes a Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect upon this receptor during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, whereby the operating machinery, assembly of PV arrays and Solar Stations will be visible through the gaps in intervening vegetation within the back gardens and along the River Witham. During operation (Year 1), the assessment notes that there will glimpsed views of the Proposed Development, which will include fencing, solar PV arrays and Solar Stations, available at the gaps in intervening vegetation within the back gardens and along the River Witham, concluding a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) visual effect at this receptor. In Year 15 of operation, the assessment notes that the proposed vegetation will have established, and alongside the existing vegetation, heavily filter the views of the Proposed Development. This is assessed to result in a Negligible Adverse (Not Significant) effect at this receptor (Winter and Summer).

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design
			- Regarding the comment that solar panels and security fencing along the western edge of Clay Lane through to Norton Disney will be clearly seen, it should be noted that this is considered in the context of the potential impact upon Bassingham residents by Viewpoint 22, as set out above. - Regarding the potential impact to the north of Fen Lane, Viewpoint 17 (see Figure 10-7 Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Barrier Earth, with Viewpoint Locations of the ES **[AS-059]**), as assessed in Appendix 10-F: Visual Assessment of the ES **[AS-120]** (ref. Table 28), considers the potential visual impact of the Proposed Development on the residents of along Fen Lane. The assessment establishes no effect at this receptor throughout construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development as a result of screening by the intervening vegetation, resulting in no change to the existing views. - Regarding the potential impact upon Aubourn, Viewpoint 10 (see Figure 10-7 Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Barrier Earth, with Viewpoint Locations of the ES **[AS-059]**), as assessed in Appendix 10-F: Visual Assessment of the ES **[AS-120]** (ref. Table 58), considers the view south from Chapel Lane, Aubourn. The assessment establishes a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect upon this receptor during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, whereby there will be glimpsed views of the construction activities, including the operating machinery and assembly of the PV arrays and Solar Stations, with views along Chapel Lane and Bassingham Road remaining focused on the road lined by hedgerows, noting that the change to the views will be subtle. During operation (Year 1), the assessment also notes that views along Chapel Lane and Bassingham Road will remain focused on the road lined by hedgerows, where the change to the views will be subtle, noting glimpses of the Onsite Substation and BESS Compound, concluding a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) visual effect at this receptor. In Year 15 of operation, the assessment notes the proposed vegetation will have established and fill the gaps in the intervening vegetation. The resultant effect is assessed to remain as Minor Adverse (Not Significant) in Winter, and reduce to Negligible Adverse (Not Significant) in Summer at this receptor.
RR-188, RR-204, RR-271	Suitability of Proposed Development	Considering that there are less than 8 hours of daylight, never mind sunshine in the depths of winter, when we most need light and heat, this is utter folly. This doesn't suit our climate. Does it really make sense to so very significantly give up highly productive farm land and the home grown food that it produces for an energy source that is at best intermittent? I don’t think so!	While solar panels generate energy primarily during daylight hours, BESS, such as that proposed for the Proposed Development, store excess energy for use during the night. Additionally, long-term energy storage solutions and grid integration ensure that energy is available throughout winter. Combining solar in a portfolio with other renewable sources and effective grid management strategies helps balance supply and demand, ensuring a reliable energy supply year-round. While the overall generation during winter will be lower due to shorter daylight hours, solar panels will still generate power even if it there is not direct sunshine on the solar arrays.
RR-081, RR-099, RR-111, RR-170, RR-172, RR-245	Inefficiency of Proposed Development	Solar is inefficient compared to other methods and is outclassed by offshore wind and flexible solar panels thin and light as cloth. Solar panels also become inefficient overtime and therefore not a good investment. Hinkley Point C, under construction in Somerset, will produce 26TWh of electricity per year for 60 years. Hinkley Point C spans 430 acres in total, making it roughly one-sixth of the size of Fosse Green Energy, despite producing a significant amount more energy, for much longer.	Solar power is cheaper to install per MW than both offshore wind and nuclear power, and the average panel still retains 80% of its efficiency after 20 years. Additionally, the Proposed Development will be re-powered throughout its lifetime to ensure consistent generation. Furthermore, by co-locating BESS with solar PV, the benefits of the renewable energy generated by the Proposed Development are maximised. BESS enables time-shifting of solar output, absorbing energy when generation exceeds demand and discharging it during system peaks in demand. This reduces curtailment, increases utilisation of solar capacity, and can provide ancillary services to the power grid. Further information is provided in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design
		Currently, 2,000 acres of solar panels are required to power around 50,000 homes, but one small modular reactor, requiring the space of just two football pitches, would power 1 million homes.	Solar technology has made significant advancements, with modern panels achieving high efficiency rates and continual improvements in performance. While efficiency varies by technology and conditions, solar panels are designed to maximise energy production even in less-than-ideal conditions. Innovations in panel design and materials continue to enhance efficiency, making solar power a viable and effective renewable energy source. The decarbonisation of all sectors is essential in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050 as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Increasing solar generation plays a key part in this – as stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands. NPS EN-3 recognises solar as a Critical National Priority, and explains that projects such as the Proposed Development and this DCO Application are required to meet the United Kingdom's Net Zero Targets. Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as being vital for a decarbonised grid and can support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear.
RR-139, RR-263	Suitability of Proposed Development	I am also concerned that whilst solar energy is in fact a sustainable and low carbon technology it is relatively low ranking in terms of output and scale in contrast to other renewable energy sources such as offshore and onshore wind and of course nuclear energy. These examples provide larger energy volume with significantly lower localised impact on the UK population. With that in mind I suspect these solar farms are utilising TEC capacity that is scarce and could be better utilised by other technologies	The decarbonisation of all sectors is essential in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050 as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Increasing solar generation plays a key part in this – as stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands. Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as being vital for a decarbonised grid and can support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear. While other sources of renewables are more space efficient than solar power, solar power has lower installation and maintenance costs. Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) capacity is determined by National Grid, and the Proposed Development is in line with achieving the government's Clean Power by 2030 (CP2030) goals.
RR-281	Time Frame	Why forty years, if we need solar now why won't we need it in forty years time?	40-60 years is the standard approved design life of large solar farms - 60 year consent has been acknowledged in the Secretary of State's decisions on a number of solar NSIPs, such as Tillbridge Solar Farm, Mallard Pass Solar Project, West Burton and Gate Burton Energy Parks, which have all been granted consent. While it is highly likely that renewable energy is still required in 60 years, this gives flexibility to adapt to new technologies that have been developed since the solar farm was consented.
RR-092	Not Temporary	Substation for 60 years – this is not a temporary development	The reference to temporary is correct in planning terms as although the infrastructure will remain for 60 years, it will be removed at decommissioning in line with the measures set out in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DO **[APP-016]**. The non-permanent and reversible nature of a solar NSIP with 60 year consent has also been acknowledged in the Secretary of State's decisions on a number of solar NSIPs, such as Tillbridge Solar Farm, Mallard Pass Solar Project, West Burton and Gate Burton

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Proposed Development Design
			Energy Parks, which have all been granted consent. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational life of the Proposed Development, the substation will be decommissioned and the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed.

7.14 General Public: Safety

Table 7-14: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Safety

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Safety	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Safety
RR-001, RR-011, RR-017, RR-022, RR-028, RR-042, RR-059, RR-065, RR-076, RR-087, RR-120, RR-145, RR-146, RR-194, RR-195, RR-225, RR-236, RR-243, RR-252, RR-281, RR-290	Safety Concerns (Proposed Development as a Whole)	There are no guarantees of safety for the population in the vicinity of the Proposed Development, no one wants to live near solar farms as "they are not safe". There are obvious safety issues with the apparatus. Specific concerns include, the proximity of high-voltage underground cables to farmland and dwellings which raises potential thermal risks, electromagnetic field (EMF) risks, heating risks and electrical fault risks if the Proposed Development is not carefully designed and maintained. The cumulative fire or electrical fault risk at substations, cable jointing and access chambers may create localized safety and contamination hazards, especially near homes or watercourses and this has not been addressed. There is also a risk of contamination of land, soils and groundwater as a result of the materials used in solar projects, leaching out from the equipment.	The safety of the population of the population in the vicinity of the Proposed Development is of paramount importance and has been considered throughout the design of the Proposed Development, and in developing the mitigation secured by the various management plans submitted with the DCO Application. Regarding EMF risk, Section 14.8 of Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics of the Environmental Statement **[APP-039]** provides an assessment of the potential impacts associated with EMF. Solar panel arrays emit EMF in the same extremely low frequency ranges as electrical appliances and wiring found in most houses and buildings. The Proposed Development would be fully compliant with relevant Government policy and all the EMFs produced would be below the relevant exposure limits and therefore no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development. Underground cables eliminate the electric field altogether as it is screened out by the sheath around the cable, but they still produce magnetic fields. The National Grid document 'Undergrounding high voltage electricity transmission lines (2015)' states that for a 400kV cable buried at 0.9 m depth, the typical magnetic field is 24 microteslas when on top of the cable and 3 microteslas at 5m from the centreline, with the maximum level known by National Grid being 96 microteslas on top of the cable at 0.9 m depth, and 13 microteslas at 5m. Taking into account this guidance and the UK limits set for safety of members of the public, the maximum reported electromagnetic field for high voltage cables buried at 0.9 m depth would comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) limits and were therefore scoped out of the assessment. The Department of Energy and Climate Change's (DECC) guidance 'Power Lines: Demonstrating Compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines. A voluntary Code of Practice (2012)' states that underground cables at voltages up to and including 132kV are considered not capable of exceeding the ICNIRP exposure guidelines for electromagnetic fields and that compliance with exposure guidelines for such equipment can be assumed unless evidence is brought to the contrary in specific cases. However, there is potential for exceedances of 132kV where infrastructure overlaps. The Interconnecting Cables between Solar PV areas are not considered in the assessment as they would have a very low voltage of less than 1kV and therefore would not significantly contribute to any increase in electromagnetic fields should they overlap with other infrastructure. Appendix 14-F: Electromagnetic Fields Assessment of the Environmental Statement **[APP-145]** provides further detail on the potential for EMF effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Regarding fire risk, the Applicant's Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** was drafted to comprehensively address all key BESS safety requirements through failure prevention, monitoring / control systems, and hazard mitigation systems / protocols.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Safety	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Safety
			They are specifically documented in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** under the following sections: Section 1.3: Potential BESS Failure Section 1.4: Safety Objectives Section 1.5 Consultation with Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service (LFR) Section 1.6: Relevant Safety Guidance for the Scheme Section 2: BESS Safety Requirements Section 3: BESS Construction and Operation Requirements Section 4: Firefighting Requirements Section 5: Pre-construction Requirements secured through the DCO Section 5 documents how detailed design phase of the Proposed Development will consider the lifecycle of the battery system from installation to decommissioning. At the detailed design stage, risk assessment tools will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. These tools and reports will ensure that there are no significant off site impacts on the local community. The Proposed Development includes embedded design mitigation and protection measures to reduce fire/explosion risk, which are detailed in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. These measures include an automatic cooling system which will be integrated into the BESS to stop or reduce battery cell thermal runaway propagation. The BESS is designed so that in the event one cell overheats/catches fire, there is sufficient distance between the cells to mitigate the risk of this spreading (to keep a fire isolated to a single cell (to the extent which it is possible to control this)). This layout has been developed in consultation with the LFRS and has taken account of guidance from the NFCC. Communication with the LFRS will continue through the detailed design and construction stages. It should be noted that there have been very few utility scale BESS fires in the UK to date, all of which were built prior to the current NFCC safety guidance, meaning that the components / setup which caused these fires are no longer permitted for use, and therefore will not be used within the BESS of the Proposed Development. With regards to the comment regarding cumulative fire or electrical fault risk at substations, substations associated with solar NSIPs are designed, constructed, and operated in accordance with established UK and international standards, including relevant British Standards, International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standards, and Distribution/Transmission Network Operator requirements. These standards specifically address electrical safety, fire prevention, fault containment, and resilience, ensuring that risks are reduced to a level that is as low as reasonably practicable. Fire risk at substations is inherently low and is not unique to solar developments. Substations are a routine and essential component of the electricity network and are present across the UK serving all forms of generation and demand. The technology used (e.g. transformers, switchgear, protection systems) is well understood and has a long operational track record. Importantly, the risk of cumulative effects is addressed through both design and regulatory controls. Each substation is independently assessed for capacity, protection coordination, and fault levels, ensuring that the introduction of additional generation does not compromise network safety. Network operators will not permit connections that would materially increase fault or fire risk, and appropriate mitigation measures — such as fire separation distances, bunding, fire-resistant construction, and automatic protection and shutdown systems — are embedded in the design.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Safety	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Safety
			Regarding the risk of contamination to the land through leaching, the source of contamination of concern is not noted in the representation, however the Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 14-C) **[APP-170]**, states in Chapter 14 Conclusions in paragraph 14.1.1 that *"The potential risks that have been identified from potential contaminated land have been assessed by the PRA as being very low to moderate / low".* It should be noted that the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. measure GC-C1), Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. measure GC-O1), and Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. measure GC-D1) all secure appropriate mitigation in the event that contamination is identified. The provision of a detailed CEMP, OEMP and DEMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the respective frameworks, is secured under Requirement 12, Requirement 13 and Requirement 20 respectively of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-086, RR-228, RR-249, RR-267, RR-287	Capacity of Emergency Services	Solar developments rely on the capacity of the local emergency services to deal with any eventual problems and the scale of the Proposed Development risks overstretching emergency services. Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, as the local fire brigade, do not have sufficient resources, sufficient staffing or sufficient funding to respond to the specialised type of fires associated with this type of development and this increases the risk of a fires having a significant impact on local villages.	The Applicant will provide funding for annual LFRS site visits for Risk Management planning and also accommodate onsite familiarisation and training exercises for firefighters. The Applicant and LFRS have agreed protective provisions to be included in the DCO for the benefit of LFRS. The insertion of these protective provisions is reflected in the updated version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which is to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline.
RR-008, RR-010, RR-012, RR-016, RR-017, RR-025, RR-028, RR-033, RR-043, RR-054, RR-058, RR-065, RR-074, RR-081, RR-086, RR-096, RR-128, RR-129, RR-144, RR-154, RR-155, RR-160, RR-173, RR-188, RR-224, RR-247, RR-249, RR-267, RR-269, RR-274, RR-276, RR-286	Safety Concerns & Fire Risk (BESS Specific)	The inclusion of a large BESS in particular raises serious fire safety concerns as these facilities present a real risk in terms of fire and explosion, particularly given the proximity to surrounding dwellings. BESS (battery storage) plants have an appalling safety record especially when it comes to fire safety. You only have to look at the Kilwinning plant near Glasgow to see the real truth about BESS. While individual batteries may have to adhere to product safety regulations, this does little to give reassurance in the context that there have been two documented incidents of a BESS fire in the UK in recent years and there are no laws that govern the safety of BESSs specifically. Recent incidents include a fire at a BESS site in Liverpool in September 2020 and a fire at a BESS project under construction in Essex in February 2025. Despite safety measures, incidents at similar facilities across the UK and internationally demonstrate that risk cannot be entirely eliminated. Lithium-ion batteries can catch fire because of thermal runaway. Such fires can be very hard to contain and extinguish. and could result in catastrophic explosion and/or air pollution with toxic fumes spreading over schools and care homes. There are no convincing means of getting an outbreak under control and no consideration given to the impact of prevailing winds which would blow smoke, flames and toxic fumes straight into the village. In the distributed BESS, solar stations (within which BESS are to be sited) are proposed on either side of the road from Aubourn to Bassingham. In the event of a fire in one of the BESS containers here,	The Applicant emphasises that the safety risks of BESS are well known in 2025, whereby design requirements, standards and guidance have evolved in response to greater understanding. the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) BESS Failure Incident Database was established in 2021 as an information tool for both energy storage industry stakeholders and the public. Statistically, the significant global increase in BESS deployments means that there will be a likely increase in the number of failure events. However, BESS failure rates dropped by 98% from 2018 to 2024 as lessons learned from BESS failure events have been incorporated into BESS design, testing requirements, control and monitoring systems, safety standards, and construction and operations best practices. Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), *Insights from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Failure Incident Database: Analysis of Failure Root Cause* , identified four primary root causes of BESS failure with the majority occurring in early lifecycle stages i.e. construction, commissioning, or within two years of operation. The Applicant emphasises that the EPRI research concluded that the primary cause of failure was rarely the battery cells or modules, and the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** is drafted to address all key safety risk reduction topics to ensure that comprehensive BESS fire and explosion hazard prevention and mitigation strategies can be developed and implemented. The provision of a detailed BSMP, which will be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. At the detailed design stage, the Applicant will only select a BESS system that, as mandated under NFPA 855[36], must have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) as part of UL 9540A tests (a standardised test method used to assess fire and explosion hazards associated with battery energy storage systems, including cell, module, unit, and installation-level testing) and / or 3rd party full scale destruction testing. This testing involves burning the full BESS system to validate safe equipment spacing and performance test active and passive mitigation systems

[36] [36] NFPA (2026) 855 – Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Safety	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Safety
		the smoke and flames will inevitably cause a danger to any vehicles travelling along this road.	integrated into the BESS design. The objective of the test is to evaluate the thermal exposure impacts from a developed BESS enclosure, to determine propagation risk to adjacent BESS or equipment. Testing also defines the length of burn, duration of Peak Heat Release Rate, maximum burn temperatures, etc. Section 5.1.5 of the Framework BSMP stipulates: "A BESS system and site specific Plume Analysis study based on the detailed design will be conducted to assess the environmental impact of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1km radius. An unplanned emissions assessment is presented within Appendix 14-G: Unplanned Emissions Assessment of the ES **[APP-176]**. Toxic gas emissions to sensitive receptors must be below relevant public health exposure limit guidelines when the battery system of a BESS is fully consumed (burnt out), production of Particulate Matter (PM) and a visibility impact assessment on any transport links within a 1 km radius of the BESS area will also be included." Final BESS design and site layout will have been validated through mandatory Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) and rigorous consequence modelling to minimise the requirement for any LFRS intervention in a thermal runaway incident. LSFT must establish minimum equipment spacing distances that demonstrate there is no fire propagation to adjacent BESS enclosures or Energy Storage System (ESS) equipment. LFRS intervention in worst-case scenarios would typically be limited to boundary cooling of adjacent BESS and ESS units to prevent the fire from spreading. This strategy will be finalised with LFRS and be clearly communicated in the Emergency Response Plan (ERP).
RR-010, RR-012, RR-016, RR-085, RR-092, RR-175, RR-176, RR-213, RR-227, RR-273, RR-289	Inadequate Emergency Response Plans	The emergency response measures are inadequately detailed and there is a lack of a clear and complete plan to deal with the risk to the infrastructure itself or the surrounding dwellings and public in the event of any fire or explosion. It is known that if these battery storage units catch fire, they take weeks to burn out and are almost impossible to put out. - What are the commitments in the event of fire in the BESS? - If a BESS fire will be left to burn out as there is no way of extinguishing a lithium fire. How and who will be responsible for the clean up? - How do the authorities allow this knowing there is a very real risk to people, property and environment? - Has there been liaison with all the Emergency Services? - Has the applicant engaged with the NHS Trust of these areas informing them about the Toxic Gases of a Thermal Runaway and will they be given a list of what these Gases and Toxic fumes contain, so they have the right antidote on board the Ambulances, when there is an explosion?	The Applicant will provide funding for annual LFRS site visits for Risk Management planning and will accommodate onsite familiarisation and training exercises for firefighters. The Applicant and LFRS have agreed protective provisions to be included in the DCO for the benefit of LFRS. The insertion of these protective provisions is reflected in the updated version of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** which is to be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline. The Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**, which has been developed in consultation with the LFRS, covers all emergency planning requirements which will take place at the detailed design stage (refer to Section 4.4). The Applicant at detailed design will only select a BESS system that as mandated under National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 guidelines[37] must have undertaken Large Scale Fire Testing (LSFT) as part of UL 9540A tests and / or 3rd party full scale destruction testing. This testing involves burning the full BESS system to validate safe equipment spacing and performance test active and passive mitigation systems integrated into the BESS design. The objective of the test is to evaluate the thermal exposure impacts from a developed BESS enclosure, to determine propagation risk to adjacent BESS or equipment. Testing also defines the length of burn, duration of Peak Heat Release Rate, maximum burn temperatures, etc.

[37] NFPA (2026) 855 – Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Safety	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Safety
			Emergency Response Plans (ERPs) can only be drafted when based upon a specific BESS design because key safety content requires that all equipment within the BESS area is defined, battery system operating limits and test data are fully defined, and the BESS failure protection system is defined. Incident response tactics require significant test data and rigorous consequence modelling from the specific BESS design to develop safe protocols for incident response. Section 4.4.4 of the Framework BSMP stipulates that the ERP will follow NFCC guidance[38] and NFPA 855 guidelines and stipulates the minimum content that an ERP must contain, including: *"Emergency procedures for all credible hazards and risks, including building, infrastructure and vehicle fire, wildfires, impacts on local respondents, impacts on transport infrastructure."* Section 5.1.1 of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** states: *"The detailed design phase of the Proposed Development will consider the lifecycle of the battery system from installation to decommissioning. At the detailed design stage, risk assessment tools will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit."* Section 5.1.5 of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**] stipulates: *"A BESS system and site specific Plume Analysis study based on the detailed design will be conducted to assess the environmental impact of a site incident to sensitive receptors within a 1km radius. An unplanned emissions assessment is presented within Appendix 14-G: Unplanned Emissions Assessment of the ES **[EN010154/APP/6.3]**. Toxic gas emissions to sensitive receptors must be below relevant public health exposure limit guidelines when the battery system of a BESS is fully consumed (burnt out), production of Particulate Matter (PM) and a visibility impact assessment on any transport links within a 1 km radius of the BESS area will also be included."* Section 5.1.10 of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** stipulates: ERPs covering construction, operation and decommissioning phases will be developed once a construction team, and an operator have been appointed. These plans will be developed in consultation with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Services and other local emergency services to include the adequate provision of firefighting equipment onsite and ensure that fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases from a thermal runaway incident does not significantly affect site operatives, first responders, and the local community. It should be noted that the Framework BSMP **[APP-189]** has been updated for clarity at paragraph 1.4.2(g) to refer to the provision of an ERP across all three of the construction, operation and decommissioning management plans that would apply to the Proposed Development (to be submitted to the Examination at the next available Examination deadline). The provision of a detailed BSMP, which will be substantially in accordance with this framework plan, is secured under Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-139, RR-148, RR-263	Insufficient Safeguards & Fire	The introduction of batteries into the countryside is again another potential risk and threat both to wildlife and local population. Undoubtedly the equipment will be guaranteed with various safety	The Applicant's Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** was drafted to comprehensively address all key BESS safety requirements through failure prevention, monitoring / control systems, and hazard mitigation systems / protocols.

[38] National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) Grid-Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS (2023 and draft revision 2024)

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Safety	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Safety
	Protection Measures (BESS)	standards and certification. However, there appears to be an increasing number of examples of recent fires associated with lithium batteries. Root cause analysis seems to suggest failures of this equipment can give rise to a reaction called thermal runaway, resulting in the release of flammable gases and potential for explosion. The application does not provide sufficient evidence of fire prevention measures, emergency service access, or appropriate buffer zones between storage facilities and residential areas. This creates unnecessary risk for nearby villages. Can safeguards be embedded into the project design review / approval and installation process to ensure adequate and professional assessments of all equipment considers every conceivable aspect concerning process safety? Furthermore, to ensure transparency these critical assessments and risk should be openly reviewed to the satisfaction of the appropriate professional bodies and services, particularly the fire brigade, who of course would be required to extinguish any fires or issues from this installation. Given the international origins of the developers there should be absolute clarity around the specific fire and safety regulations within the UK legislation that must be adhered to. In the unlikely event of a fire either at the main substation, or the local battery units how will the developer manage containment of any toxic material/substances that could be released to the ground/drainage ditches/waterways that could have detrimental impacts to wildlife	These are specifically documented in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** under the following sections: Section 1.3: Potential BESS Failure Section 1.4: Safety Objectives Section 1.5 Consultation with Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service (LFR) Section 1.6: Relevant Safety Guidance for the Scheme (UK and International) Section 2: BESS Safety Requirements Section 3: BESS Construction and Operation Requirements Section 4: Firefighting Requirements Section 5: Pre-construction Requirements secured through the DCO Section 5 documents how the detailed design phase of the Proposed Development will consider the lifecycle of the battery system from installation to decommissioning. At the detailed design stage, risk assessment tools will be utilised together with detailed consequence modelling to provide a comprehensive site operations and emergency response safety audit. These tools and reports will ensure that there are no significant off site impacts on the local community. Section 4.5 of the FBSMP documents how BESS fire pollution issues will be addressed (fire emissions and water pollution). Section 5.1.10 of the FBSMP stipulates that Emergency Response Plans (ERPs) covering construction, operation and decommissioning phases will be developed once a construction team, and an operator have been appointed. These plans will be developed in consultation LFRS and other local emergency services to include the adequate provision of firefighting equipment onsite and ensure that fire, smoke, and any release of toxic gases from a thermal runaway incident does not significantly affect site operatives, first responders, and the local community. The provision of a detailed BSMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Control of firewater runoff is set out within Appendix *9*-D Framework SWDS **[APP-147]**. This states that swales will be lined with an impermeable membrane or similar to prevent any pollution associated with fire water runoff from entering the ground. Automatic penstock control valves will also be used in the event of a fire to prevent any pollution associated with fire water runoff from entering the local watercourses without prior testing. A detailed drainage strategy will be prepared, to be substantially in accordance with the framework, as secured by Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. These measures will ensure that there will be no significant effects arising from the potential contamination of surface water or groundwater.
RR-243	Health & Safety of Construction	I have health and safety concerns with the construction	The construction works will be carried out in accordance with the management plans submitted with the DCO Application which will manage and mitigate potential health and safety issues. For example, the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** (ref. paragraph 2.1.1) sets out that a Health and Safety Manager will be responsible for the monitoring and controlling of health and safety compliance and related rules and regulations onsite. Furthermore, measure MAD-C1 notes: *“All*

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Safety	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Safety
			works will be undertaken in accordance with relevant Health and Safety legislation and guidance and plans will be put in place. Details of fire, police, emergency services and hospitals will be publicised and included in the DCO Site induction." The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

7.15 General Public: The Applicant & Funding

Table 7-15: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
RR-155	Lack of Consideration by Applicant	This piecemeal approach to future energy by successive governments has led to an immoral 'klondike' for unethical international corporations - chancers, as with Covid contracts - with no care, consideration nor understanding of the effects of their insatiable search for profits will have on localities that mean everything to the people who live in them. This should not be done to us. The sheer number of applications over Lincolnshire must surely demonstrate the rapacious, cynical attitude of corporate business. We should be protected from this sort of exploitation	It should be noted that the Proposed Development responds to the current climate crisis, whereby the decarbonisation of all sectors is essential in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050 as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Increasing solar generation plays a key part in this – as stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the lowest cost way of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands. NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector.*" Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as vital for a decarbonised grid as it is able to support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear. As the UK decarbonises its economy, demand for electricity is projected to double by 2040. With the Clean Power Target of 45- 47 GW of solar generation capacity by 2030, and 45-69 GW by 2035; large-scale projects such as the Proposed Development will be crucial to meeting this benchmark. Large-scale solar must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching NPS EN-1. The reasoning behind the need for the Proposed Development is set out fully in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. Section 6.2 of Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-031]**, sets out the relevant legislation and policy with respect to greenhouse gas emissions which make clear the need for the Proposed Development and solar energy generation in general to achieve the UK's Net Zero targets. Furthermore, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the Order Limits against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. The Applicant strongly disagrees with the statement that there has been no care, consideration or understanding of the effects of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to minimise impacts on the environment and local communities. This has been achieved through undertaking a comprehensive and robust Environmental Impact Assessment to identify significant effects and mitigate these wherever needed, as well as recognising beneficial design opportunities. For example, based upon the current landscaping designs presented in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, linking together existing walking

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
			routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore, should the Proposed Development be granted consent, the Applicant will provide a community benefit fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. This community fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, as determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to determine what a 'community benefit' should be. The Applicant is currently investigated how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. A community benefit fund would only be provided if consent is granted for the Proposed Development. Other wider benefits are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including ecological enhancements, employment generation and economic benefits. As discussed in the Funding Statement **[AS-014]** submitted with the DCO Application, the Applicant is a partnership between Windel Energy Limited and Recurrent Energy (a subsidiary of Canadian Solar), who are both experienced developers of renewable energy projects. Windel Energy has more than 5 gigawatts of clean, renewable power and battery energy storage in various stages of development. Windel Energy is committed to responsible land use and believes the development and delivery of a large-scale solar energy and storage park can be achieved in harmony with its surroundings. Recurrent Energy, a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc., is one of the world's largest and most geographically diversified utility-scale solar and energy storage project development, ownership, and operations platforms. With an industry-leading team of in-house energy experts, Recurrent Energy serves as Canadian Solar's global development and power services business. To date, Recurrent Energy has successfully developed, built, and connected approximately 12 GWp of solar projects and more than 6 GWh of energy storage projects across six continents. As of the date of this document, its global pipeline includes over 25 GWp of solar and 69 GWh of energy storage capacity. Recurrent Energy regularly on its commitment to several environmental, social, and governance factors, including its commitment to responsible and ethical business practices. Its most recent report can be found here: https://recurrentenergy.com/recurrent-energy-releases-2024-sustainability-report/
RR-022	Motive of Applicant	My question to the team running this has a deal already been made without consultation ? Who would agree a rental of this huge area without some kind of confidence the project would go ahead? I need answers . WE MUST PROTECT EACH OTHER BEFORE ITS TOO LATE. GREEDY PROFIT DRIVEN PROJECTS SHOULD STOP YOU MUST ACT NOW FOR US.	It should be noted that no deal has been made that guarantees the outcome of the DCO Application. The Planning Inspectorate, upon receipt of the DCO Application, was required to consider whether the Applicant had carried out adequate consultation in accordance with legislative requirements. The Planning Inspectorate invited the relevant local authorities to submit an adequacy of consultation response – these can be found within the Fosse Green Energy Examination Library at AoC-001 to AoC-013. The acceptance of the DCO Application for

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
			examination confirms that it is considered that adequate and statutorily compliant consultation has been undertaken. During the site selection process, as detailed in Planning Statement Appendix A: Site Selection Report **[APP-098]**, the availability of willing landowners was an important consideration and suitable landowners were approached by the Applicant to discuss inclusion of their landholdings into the Proposed Development. The land rights secured by the Applicant across the Order Limits are outlined in the Book of Reference **[AS-115]** submitted with the DCO Application, and have been obtained by the Applicant through voluntary agreement with the respective parties.
RR-110, RR-172	Motive of Applicant	Whilst there are vast tracts of industrial land, wasted land adjacent to major roads and railways, rooftops available to use, these are potentially less profitable for the landowners and developers. Profit potential however should not be the deciding factor. Energy developers must properly consider alternatives, not just depend on companies or landowners keen to profit. Placed on roofs, built structures or industrial land would be better than productive farmland. Farmland is taken here, not because it is most suitable, but for profit, directly displacing food production.	With regards to exploring the scope to utilise rooftops and non-agricultural land (such as brownfield sites) for development, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. Three sites over 1 hectare (2.47 acres) were identified, however none of the sites was large enough to provide a viable land parcel of at least 40 ha, therefore no individual brownfield site from the brownfield land registers provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50 MW. Furthermore, two of the three sites had planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. In addition, the potential alternative site, Hawdin's Wood, included areas of the former RAF Swinderby airfield, however given the site has been developed for a range of uses, it was not available for the purposes of the Proposed Development. The use of agricultural land, including BMV land, has also been carefully considered through the site selection process set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, as well as through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar schemes, including on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
			dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to the adequate and dependable electricity generation mix required to meet the energy security decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. These land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. With regards to the concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon agricultural production, this is considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. The 1,018.7ha of agricultural land required temporarily for construction and operation constitutes 0.09% of the total farmland in the East midlands and is unlikely to result in an impact of food production or an increase of food imports. Research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the agricultural land within the Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Proposed Development has also been designed recognising the need to allow current farming practices to continue where possible. The Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181 ha (447.3) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land.
RR-144, RR-147, RR-148, RR-160, RR-192, RR-281	Financial Position of Applicant	The Proposed Development is not financially viable as the financial position of the applicant is wholly inadequate to support and implement this project. The applicant, appears to be in considerable debt and incapable of financing this project which raises serious concerns about the potential financial damage and burden that the local community and council would have to bear if they become insolvent. As no provision is made for the cost of restoring the land after forty years, my guess is that the applicant will go into liquidation just prior to that and the state will have to pay as usual.	The financial position of the Applicant and the proposed funding structure for the Proposed Development is detailed within the Funding Statement **[APP-021]** This document sets out the estimated current capital cost for the Proposed Development and the Proposed Development funding strategy, including confirmation that Recurrent Energy has access to significant funds to implement the Proposed Development. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, which is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which provides that decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, it will be

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
		The developer has not demonstrated clear financial resilience or decommissioning arrangements. There is no guarantee that the land will be restored. The developer should be required to provide legally binding restoration bonds to guarantee that the land will be reinstated if the company goes into liquidation in the future. Without this, the community will be exposed to future liabilities, and it will fall to the taxpayer to fund the decommissioning.	decommissioned in line with the controls set out within the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (the provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), with the land reinstated to its original quality, and returned to the landowners who would choose how the land is to be used and managed. It should be noted that the breach of any commitments under a DCO amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority. The Applicant therefore does not consider a restoration bond to be necessary or proportionate. Funding for restoration of land is not required to be secured under the Planning Act 2008, nor is the Applicant aware of any guidance requiring this in the NPSs or otherwise. Given that decommissioning of the Proposed Development is adequately controlled by virtue of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** the Applicant considers that any further requirement would be a duplication of existing controls potentially creating confusion. The production of a detailed DEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Given the legally binding obligation to carry out decommissioning works, including the funding of the same, the provision of a restoration bond is not justified.
RR-191, RR-255, RR-289	Integrity of Applicant	The statements referencing the scheme's output are questionable. These corporate developers lack understanding. "People feel very strongly that our farmland and countryside is being targeted by so many so called ‘companies’ swamping this area".	EN-3 states that solar farms require between 2 and 4 acres per MW of output, (Para 3.10.8) but acknowledges that this will vary “with some being larger and some being smaller.” The Proposed Development, as based on the Indicative Principal Site Layout Plan, would amount to a scale and density of development at 2.94 acres per MW or 3.53 MW for single -axis tracker PV panels. This being in the range considered acceptable by NPS EN-3. Furthermore, by co-locating battery energy storage systems (BESS) with solar PV, the Proposed Development has sought to maximise the benefits of the renewable energy generated by the Proposed Development. BESS enables time-shifting of solar output, absorbing energy when generation exceeds demand and discharging it during system peaks in demand. This reduces curtailment, increases utilisation of solar capacity, and can provide ancillary services to the power grid. Further information is provided in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. It is important that the electrical grid is supported by both intermittent generation sources (e.g. solar/wind) and fast-response generation sources (i.e. gas fired turbines). In the Government report on decarbonising the electricity sector[39] a total of 70 GW of solar energy capacity is targeted by 2035 (currently the UK is at 16 GW), a proportion of which is intended to be supplied by the Proposed Development. The Applicant strongly disagrees that they lack understanding. The Applicant is a partnership between Windel Energy Limited and Recurrent Energy (a subsidiary of Canadian Solar), who are both experienced developers of renewable energy projects. Windel Energy has more than 5 gigawatts of clean, renewable power and battery energy storage in various stages of development. Windel Energy is committed to responsible land use and believes the development and delivery of a large-scale solar energy and storage park can be achieved in harmony with its surroundings. Recurrent Energy, a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc., is one of the world's largest and most geographically diversified utility-scale solar and energy storage project development, ownership, and operations platforms. With an industry-leading team of in-house energy experts, Recurrent Energy serves as Canadian Solar’s global development and power services business. To date, Recurrent Energy has successfully developed, built, and

[39] Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee, 2023. Decarbonisation of the power sector: Eleventh Report of Session 2022–23

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
			connected approximately 12 GWp of solar projects and more than 6 GWh of energy storage projects across six continents. As of the date of this document, its global pipeline includes over 25 GWp of solar and 69 GWh of energy storage capacity. It should be noted that the Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to both minimise impacts on the environment and local communities as well as recognise beneficial design opportunities. For example, based upon the current landscaping designs presented in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created, linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha (4.4 acres) new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, sets out the permissive path network will be implemented during operation of the Proposed Development providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore, should the Proposed Development be granted consent, the Applicant will provide a community benefit fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. This community benefit fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, as determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to determine what a 'community benefit' should be. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. A community benefit fund would only be provided if the Proposed Development is consented. Other wider benefits are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including ecological enhancements, employment generation and economic benefits.
RR-040, RR-068, RR-132, RR-144, RR-149, RR-161, RR-175, RR-176, RR-177, RR-257, RR-276, RR-281	Motive of Applicant	The Proposed Development is not about future energy security or counteracting climate change. The motive is financial and with foreign equity driving many of these developments, the financial benefits are going to overseas investors. The developers aren't bothered as they don't live locally and are only interested in the financial benefits. Although there may be minor financial benefits for some landowners, this is at the detriment of local residents. The main incentive for the use of this technology is the state paid incentives. Companies are cashing in on government money being handed out without consideration of a long term strategy.	It should be noted that the Proposed Development directly relates to energy security and counteracting climate change. NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector.*" Paragraph 2.10.10 of NPS EN-3 goes on to confirm that solar has an important role in delivering the government's goals for greater energy independence including those of the British Energy Security Strategy which sets out that the government expects a five-fold increase in combined ground and rooftop solar deployment by 2035 (up to 70GW). Furthermore, the Government recognises in the NPS EN-1 that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable electricity generation mix required to meet the energy security and decarbonisation needs of the UK, whereby the decarbonisation of all sectors is essential in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050 as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Large-scale solar must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
			line with the overarching NPS EN-1. The reasoning behind the need for the Proposed Development is set out fully in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**. Solar is one of the cheapest forms of electricity generation and is not supported by Government subsidies. The Proposed Development is not funded by, nor is it intended to be subsidised by, the Government. A Funding Statement **[AS-014]** was prepared and submitted with the DCO Application, which sets out the estimated current capital cost for the Proposed Development and the Proposed Development funding strategy, including confirmation that the Applicant has access to sufficient funds to implement the Proposed Development (including compulsory acquisition compensation costs). Fosse Green Energy Limited is a company registered in England and Wales with Companies House (Company number 13438725). It is owned by Windel Energy Ltd, a company registered in England and Wales, and Rugeley West Solar Limited, another company registered in England and Wales. Rugeley West Solar Limited is owned by CS UK Holdings III Limited which is part of Recurrent Energy which is a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc. Both companies have a strong UK presence, with over 100 Recurrent Energy employees located in the UK. It should be noted that the Proposed Development is intended to benefit the English ownership as well as the Canadian Solar investors – the Applicant will remain an English company during the operation of the Proposed Development. Regarding local benefits, the Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to both minimise impacts on the environment and local communities as well as recognise beneficial design opportunities. For example, based upon the current landscaping designs presented in the Landscape Mitigation Plan, which forms Appendix A of the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created (to be secured by Requirement 8 and Requirement 17 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), linking together existing walking routes and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages, as well as the provision of a 1.8ha new community orchard with open access within the landscaping designs, offering a direct benefit for the local community. The Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, and therefore, should the Proposed Development be granted consent, the Applicant will provide a community benefit fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. This community benefit fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, as determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to determine what a 'community benefit' should be. The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. A community benefit fund would only be provided if the Proposed Development is consented. Other wider benefits are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including ecological enhancements, employment generation and economic benefits.
RR-249	Integrity of Applicant	How does the government know who would actually deliver and run this project, given that I understand that the rights for the whole scheme can simply be sold on should planning be granted? If the project is nationally important, shouldn't the need for responsible,	If the Development Consent Order for the Proposed Development is granted it will be specific to Fosse Green Energy Limited and, save for some limited scenarios, it would only be capable of being implemented by Fosse Green Energy Limited. The Proposed Development will be subject to the Requirements of the DCO, and even if it is sold the Proposed Development will continue

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
		transparent, fully-British ownership be a primary consideration? Along with priority given to projects guaranteeing use of British-manufactured equipment, technology and workforce?	to be subject to the Requirements. Furthermore, any future owner of the Proposed Development would need to be licensed under the Electricity Act 1989. It should be noted that Fosse Green Energy Limited is a company registered in England and Wales with Companies House (Company number 13438725). It is owned by Windel Energy Ltd, a company registered in England and Wales, and Rugeley West Solar Limited, another company registered in England and Wales. Rugeley West Solar Limited is owned by CS UK Holdings III Limited which is part of Recurrent energy which is a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc.
RR-172	Shell Companies	These projects are mainly fronted by shell companies set up to profit from the planning permission, with debts, but minimal assets, no staff, no bonds, nor parent company guarantees - leaving communities at risk and tax-payers to pay for the consequences. How will local councils hold these offshore shells to environmental conditions, or fire safety. That leaves citizens to suffer and the public purse to pick up the pieces for failed legislation. Meanwhile electricity prices remain high to keep these foreign or global companies in business, draining money from the pockets of our citizens overseas and no opportunity left to build British resilience.	Fosse Green Energy Limited is a company registered in England and Wales with Companies House (Company number 13438725). It is owned by Windel Energy Ltd, a company registered in England and Wales, and Rugeley West Solar Limited, another company registered in England and Wales. Rugeley West Solar Limited is owned by CS UK Holdings III Limited which is part of Recurrent Energy which is a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc. Both companies have a strong UK presence, with over 100 Recurrent Energy employees in the UK. The financial position of the Applicant and the proposed funding structure for the Proposed Development is detailed within the Funding Statement **[APP-021]**. This document sets out the estimated current capital cost for the Proposed Development and the Proposed Development funding strategy, including confirmation that Recurrent Energy has access to significant funds to implement the Proposed Development. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, which is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order, which provides that decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, it will be decommissioned in line with the controls set out within the Framework DEMP (the provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO), with the land reinstated to its original quality, and returned to the landowners who would choose how the land is to be used and managed. If the Development Consent Order is granted, the Applicant will be subject to the Requirements contained within Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which sets out the mechanisms by which the Proposed Development would be controlled. During the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development, mitigation to minimise and avoid adverse impacts to the environment will be implemented in line with the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**, Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** and Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**. Furthermore, with regards to fire safety, the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** sets out design and mitigation measures to be implemented as part of the Proposed Development detailed design. The Applicant has consulted the NFCC guidelines and engaged with LFRS throughout the pre-application phase, whereby close consultation will continue with LFRS throughout the planning process. The provision of a detailed CEMP, OEMP, DEMP and BSMP, which are to be substantially in accordance with the framework plans, is secured under Requirements 12, 13, 20 and 7 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** respectively. It should be noted that the breach of any commitments under a DCO amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
RR-139, RR-144, RR-263, RR-286	Structure of Applicant Company	Concern regarding the complex legal structuring of the companies involved in this development. Concerns regarding the honesty and sincerity of those who are proposing the scheme. Although the Canadian Senior partner has some existing presence within the UK, these solar farms are still relatively small scale and are less likely to have the continuity and experience (and credibility) of some of the larger and longer established renewables sector developers and operators already present within the UK.	It should be noted that the Applicant is a partnership between Windel Energy Limited and Recurrent Energy (a subsidiary of Canadian Solar), who are both experienced developers of renewable energy projects. Windel Energy has more than 5 gigawatts of clean, renewable power and battery energy storage in various stages of development. Recurrent Energy, a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc., is one of the world's largest and most geographically diversified utility-scale solar and energy storage project development, ownership, and operations platforms. With an industry-leading team of in-house energy experts, Recurrent Energy serves as Canadian Solar's global development and power services business. To date, Recurrent Energy has successfully developed, built, and connected approximately 12 GWp of solar projects and more than 6 GWh of energy storage projects across six continents. It should be noted that Recurrent Energy's experience in the UK includes Tillbridge Solar Project and Mallard Pass Solar Farm; two consented solar Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects with a combined 740MW capacity. As of the date of this document, its global pipeline includes over 25 GWp of solar and 69 GWh of energy storage capacity. It should be noted that the breach of any commitments under a DCO (such as that regarding the decommissioning of the Proposed Development, which is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which provides that decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning) amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority.
RR-192	Lack of Applicant Experience	There is serious risk of environmental damage to the actual, and surrounding, area through this project as the applicant has no resource or expertise in safely delivering such projects and exposes the area and its residents to risk from unsafe battery installation design, construction pollution and damage, pollution and waste of agricultural land, let alone the serious disruption to the area and its residents - both human and animal.	Regarding the risk of environmental damage to the Order Limits and surrounding area, the Proposed Development has been iteratively and holistically designed to minimise impacts on the environment. This has been achieved through undertaking a comprehensive and robust Environmental Impact Assessment to identify significant effects and mitigate these wherever needed, for example by securing mitigation measures within the environmental management plans submitted with the DCO Application, as well as recognising beneficial design opportunities. Regarding the Applicant's experience, the Applicant benefits in being a partnership between Windel Energy Limited and Recurrent Energy (a subsidiary of Canadian Solar), both of whom are experienced developers of renewable energy projects. Windel Energy has more than 5 gigawatts of clean, renewable power and battery energy storage in various stages of development. Recurrent Energy, a subsidiary of Canadian Solar Inc., is one of the world's largest and most geographically diversified utility-scale solar and energy storage project development, ownership, and operations platforms. With an industry-leading team of in-house energy experts, Recurrent Energy serves as Canadian Solar's global development and power services business. To date, Recurrent Energy has successfully developed, built, and connected approximately 12 GWp of solar projects and more than 6 GWh of energy storage projects across six continents. Regarding the risk from unsafe battery installation and design, the design of the BESS and its potential impacts are controlled in several ways, such as through buffers and offsets embedded into the Proposed Development design (e.g. the Applicant has committed to a minimum buffer of 200m from the centralised BESS infrastructure and 150m from the distributed BESS infrastructure to residential receptors - this is far in excess of the 25m offset required by the National Fire Chief Council from residences for safety, as referenced in paragraph 2.3.5 of the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]** (which has been updated and will be submitted to the Examination at the next available examination deadline), and through ensuring the detailed design of the BESS is in line with the measures (e.g. specified safety control measures) set out in the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**. Prior to commencement of construction of the BESS, a BSMP (to be substantially in accordance with the Framework BSMP **[APP-198]**) is required to be

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
			submitted to NKDC and approved, in consultation with LCC, the EA and LFRS, in accordance with Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This detailed BSMP must be implemented as approved and maintained throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. As part of the preparation of the detailed BSMP, the Applicant will take into account the applicable good practices for battery system failure prevention and detection, consequence modelling, risk analysis, and emergency response planning, as guidance continues to develop both in the UK and around the world. Regarding the "waste" of agricultural land, it should be also noted that the loss of agricultural land has been carefully considered by the sensitive and iterative design of the Proposed Development, whereby the Proposed Development has been designed with recognition of the need to allow current farming practices to continue where possible. As a result, the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181 ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed, substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO), which provides for current farming practices to continue whilst offering other benefits, for example in relation to bird mitigation habitats. This retained arable land includes approximately 116 ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV agricultural land. Regarding construction pollution and damage and the disruption to the area and its residents during construction of the Proposed Development, the Environmental Statement has undertaken a number of assessments in this regard, for example relating to potential impacts upon the water environment and ecology, and also with regards to the potential impacts as a result of construction traffic and noise and vibration. The assessments undertaken informed the requirements for mitigation to be secured by the various management plans submitted with the DCO Application – for example, the Framework CTMP **[AS-102]** sets out the measures to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Proposed Development along the local highway network, in order to limit potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. The Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** sets out measures to protect the water environment and ecological receptors, for example via managing surface run-off and implementing ecological protection measures. As summarised in Chapter 16 Summary of Environmental Effects of the ES **[APP-041]**, significant adverse effects relating to the construction phase relate to landscape and visual and vibration impacts only. However, these significant landscape and visual impacts will be temporary, due to the transient nature of the construction works. With regards to the potential for significant vibration effects, it should be noted that this assessment is based on worst-case parameters and as such, the findings are likely to over-estimate vibration levels. If driven piling is to be undertaken, a commitment is included in the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to undertake a construction vibration risk assessment such that significant effects would be avoided. In the event that exceeding the relevant levels is unavoidable, the risk assessment would focus on limiting the exposure of nearby receptors to levels of vibration exceeding the relevant thresholds as far as reasonably practicable. Furthermore, the timing of any driven piling within 60m of residential receptors will be delayed until after 10am to avoid more sensitive time periods. Again, these significant effects would only occur for the short-term duration during which the driven piling works (if undertaken) are happening near to these residences. Management and mitigation measures have been included within the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]** to minimise these impacts as far as practical. The provision of a detailed CEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding	Response to Relevant Representations relating to the Applicant and Funding
RR-222	Funding for Decommissioning	Funding Statement: The Applicant states "The current capital cost estimate for the Proposed Development is approximately £340M. This estimate covers all aspects of the Proposed Development and has been arrived at by including construction costs, preparation costs, supervision costs, land acquisition costs, compulsory acquisition compensation costs, equipment purchase, installation and commissioning." The current capital cost DOES NOT cover all aspects as decommissioning is not included. In over 60 years time, the estimated cost of decommissioning will be significant (£100M+ ?); how does the Applicant intend to ensure adequate provision will be made and the cost will not fall to NKDC?	The Applicant notes that decommissioning costs are not included in the capital cost estimate of the Proposed Development presented in the Funding Statement **[APP-021]**. Given the timeframe (60+ years), any such estimate is likely to carry significant assumptions and limitations, whereby advancements in technology by the late 21st Century have the potential to significantly affect cost estimates. It should be noted however that the decommissioning of the Proposed Development is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which provides that decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning, with the land reinstated to its original quality, and returned to the landowners who would choose how the land is to be used and managed. The breach of any commitments under a DCO, such as this decommissioning commitment, amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority. The Applicant does not consider a restoration bond to be necessary or proportionate. Funding for restoration of land is not required to be secured under the Planning Act 2008, nor is the Applicant aware of any guidance requiring this in the NPSs or otherwise. Given that decommissioning of the Proposed Development is adequately controlled by virtue of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, the Applicant considers that any further requirement would be a duplication of existing controls potentially creating confusion.

i.

7.16 General Public: Consultation and Engagement

Table 7-16: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement
RR-017	Community Engagement	Will everyone who this project will affect be given the chance to air their views and their concerns be taken seriously and not ignored.	The Applicant has a duty to and has taken into account all responses to the Non-Statutory and Statutory consultation. The Consultation Report **[APP-023]**, and specifically Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 of the report, explains how the Applicant has had regard to consultation responses. The consultation process was designed to engage with the local communities which may be most affected by the Proposed Development. The Applicant defined a Core Consultation Zone of 3 km from the site which received a direct mailing at each consultation and a Wider Consultation Zone of 5 km from the site. This was to reach interested individuals or parties who were not only within the Core Consultation Zone. The Applicant also consulted with stakeholders including elected representatives, seldom heard groups, landowners, community organisations and statutory stakeholders as defined in s42 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant used a range of methods to share information about the proposals and to reach different audiences. This included digital methods - a project website, holding webinars and hosting online feedback forms, as well as holding in-person events and sending hard-copy letters to residents and other stakeholders. The consultation process was open to anyone who wished to take part and feedback could be given by letter, feedback form or email. Following submission of the DCO application the Applicant's website remains open and includes information on how to get in touch with the Applicant to share their views. Submitting Relevant Representations allows individuals to become "interested parties" for the purposes of the Examination to enable them to continue have their say in relation to the DCO Application. The Planning Inspectorate, upon receipt of the DCO Application, was required to consider whether the Applicant had carried out adequate consultation in accordance with legislative requirements. The Planning Inspectorate invited the relevant local authorities to submit an adequacy of consultation response – these can be found within the Fosse Green Energy Examination Library at AoC-001 to AoC-013. The acceptance of the DCO Application for examination confirms that it is considered that adequate and compliance consultation has been undertaken.
RR-075	Lack of Community Engagement	Fosse Green Energy Limited Proposal – A Scheme That Ignores Community Voice I have already submitted detailed objections to this scheme on multiple grounds: the lack of clear and specific government support for developments of this nature in such locations; the disjointed, and at times disingenuous, consultation process undertaken by Fosse Green Energy Limited; and the failure to properly consider far more appropriate alternatives, such as brownfield sites and large-scale deployment of solar infrastructure on industrial and commercial rooftops.	The Applicant went beyond the procedural requirements and engaged early in the development process allowing for the consideration of feedback at a formative stage. Both a non-statutory and statutory consultation were held, as well as a community liaison group meeting, meetings with landowners and meetings with other interested parties. The Proposed Development has been designed to include measures to minimise impacts on nearby communities, respond sensitively to local context, such as landscape, habitats, wildlife and heritage, and provide landscape and ecological enhancements. The Applicant considered feedback throughout the pre-application process and made changes to the design of the Proposed Development through this consideration of feedback.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement
		What is particularly galling is the apparent disregard shown by Fosse Green Energy Limited — and seemingly the planning process to date — for the widespread and credible objections raised by dozens of local residents. These are not fringe complaints, but informed, passionate, and legitimate concerns that deserve proper scrutiny. It is simply unacceptable that the views of the very people who will live with the consequences of this development are treated as a procedural formality. The Planning Inspectorate has a duty to ensure that public consultation is not a box-ticking exercise. Local voices must not be drowned out by commercial interests. I urge you to reject this application — not because renewable energy is undesirable, but because this proposal is a badly located, poorly justified, and deeply unpopular project that would do more harm than good.	The Applicant has a duty to and has taken into account all responses to the non-statutory and statutory consultation. The Consultation Report **[APP-5.1]**, and specifically Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 of the report, explains how the Applicant has had regard to consultation responses. The Applicant has considered and responded in the consultation report to objections to the Proposed Development, including objections to its location. The methodology adopted for the site selection process is set out in Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**.
RR-041	Insufficient Consultation	"Local communities have not been adequately consulted about the route's proximity to homes and public rights of way."	The Planning Inspectorate, upon receipt of the DCO Application, was required to consider whether the Applicant had carried out adequate consultation in accordance with legislative requirements. The Planning Inspectorate invited the relevant local authorities to submit an adequacy of consultation response – these can be found within the Fosse Green Energy Examination Library at AoC-001 to AoC-013. The acceptance of the DCO Application for examination confirms that it is considered that adequate and compliance consultation has been undertaken. Local communities were invited to have their say on any aspect of the Proposed Development they wished to comment on during non-statutory (11 September 2023 to 20 October 2023) and statutory (21 October 2024 to 2 December 2024) consultation events, including on the Grid Connection Corridor's proximity to homes and PRoW. The Applicant has a duty to and has taken into account all responses to the non-statutory and statutory consultation. The Consultation Report **[APP-023]**, and specifically Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 of the report, explains how the Applicant has had regard to consultation responses. At the non-statutory consultation and statutory consultation Layout Plans were published in a consultation brochure showing the Proposed Development's Red Line Boundary. PRoW and nearby settlements were also shown on the Layout Plans. The Layout Plans were created to be accessible for non-technical stakeholders and were available online, at events and at information points. Plans of the Grid Connection Corridor were also available and at statutory consultation the Preliminary Environmental Information Report contained information on PRoW including a Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]**.
RR-235	Insufficient Consultation	No consultation regarding the Airmen's Quarters section of Witham St Hughs. (To date we have had peace and quiet, dark skies and no security issues). Already we live in a Covenant area and are subject to changes that the landowner may impose. No mention has been made (that I am aware of) regarding the landowner and his appointed agent. I live right on the furthermost edge of the area, adjacent to the Fosse Green proposed project."	The consultation process was designed to engage with those local communities who may be most affected by the Proposed Development. The Applicant defined a Core Consultation Zone of 3 km from the site which received a direct mailing at each consultation and a Wider Consultation Zone of 5 km from the site. This was to reach interested individuals or parties who were not only within the Core Consultation Zone. As set out in the Consultation Report **[APP-023]**, Witham St Hughs was within the Core Consultation Zone, whereby the Applicant issued a postcard to 11,883 Core Consultation Zone addresses, and events were held at Witham St Hughs Village Hall at the non-statutory

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement
			consultation stage (30 September 2023) and statutory consultation stage (23 September 2023), as well as a number of other local venues across these consultation periods. Anyone with an interest in the Proposed Development was welcome to attend events and take part in the consultations by providing feedback. The Planning Inspectorate, upon receipt of the DCO Application, was required to consider whether the Applicant had carried out adequate consultation in accordance with legislative requirements. The Planning Inspectorate invited the relevant local authorities to submit an adequacy of consultation response – these can be found within the Fosse Green Energy Examination Library at AoC-001 to AoC-013. The acceptance of the DCO Application for examination confirms that it is considered that adequate and statutorily compliant consultation has been undertaken.
RR-182	Insufficient Response to Consultation	Failure of Foss green energy to respond to previous consultation through revised proposals.	The Applicant has a duty to and has taken into account all responses to the non-statutory and statutory consultation. The Consultation Report **[APP-5.1]**, and specifically Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 of the report, explains how the Applicant has had regard to consultation responses. The Proposed Development has been informed by a comprehensive, iterative design process that has sought to minimise environmental effects. The Proposed Development has been developed and refined in response to consultation feedback from statutory consultees, local stakeholders and persons with land interest, with such engagement helping to shape the layout and approach to land use to minimise environmental impacts. The Applicant held a non-statutory consultation showing early proposals for the Proposed Development. This was followed with a statutory consultation where revised proposals were shown with the changes were communicated in documents including the Consultation Booklet. The Applicant also published a Community Update in March 2025 which explained the main changes made following the statutory consultation.
RR-226, RR-250	Insufficient Consultation & Lack of Meaningful Engagement	We are deeply concerned about the lack of meaningful engagement with the local community. A project of this magnitude demands transparent and inclusive consultation. Instead, residents have been presented with one-sided information sessions, leaving many—including myself—uninformed about the long-term consequences. This approach fails to respect the democratic process and the voices of those most affected.	The Planning Inspectorate, upon receipt of the DCO Application, was required to consider whether the Applicant had consulted adequately and in accordance with legislative requirements. The Planning Inspectorate invited the relevant local authorities to submit an adequacy of consultation response – these can be found within the Fosse Green Energy Examination Library at AoC-001 to AoC-013. The acceptance of the DCO Application for examination confirms that it is considered that adequate and compliance consultation has been undertaken. The Applicant has a duty to and has taken into account all responses to the non-statutory and statutory consultation. The Consultation Report **[APP-023]**, and specifically Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 of the report, explains how the Applicant has had regard to consultation responses. The non-statutory and statutory consultation events were open to anyone who wished to attend. Attendees were able to ask questions about the Proposed Development and the ways for attendees to provide feedback were presented during the events. The events for the non-statutory (11 September 2023 to 20 October 2023) and statutory (21 October 2024 to 2 December 2024) consultations were scheduled at a range of times and took

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Consultation and Engagement
			place on both weekdays and weekends, at various venues to enable people with different time commitments to attend the events. An evening online webinar was also held during each consultation to allow people to attend who could not travel to the in-person events. The Applicant used a range of methods to share information about the proposals and to reach different audiences. This included digital methods - a project website, holding webinars and hosting online feedback forms, as well as holding in-person events and sending hard-copy letters to residents and other stakeholders. The Applicant attended events and had members of the team with different specialisms available for attendees to talk to. The Applicant welcomed the opportunity to have conversations with people and were able to answer questions about the Proposed Development. At the in-person events there was information available including information banners, plans of the Proposed Development, the PEI Report (at statutory consultation) and a feedback area for people to leave their views. The events were designed to be 'drop-ins' rather than formal presentations, allowing people to attend when suited them best, and allowing for two-sided conversations.

7.17 General Public: Decommissioning

Table 7-17: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning
RR-017, RR-027, RR-086, RR-092, RR-096, RR-139, RR-161, RR-177, RR-189, RR-192, RR-245, RR-246, RR-249, RR-263, RR-269	Disposal of Components Following Decommissioning	Concerns regarding the Applicant's plans for the disposal of the solar PV panels which have reached end of life as the application does not provide explicit detail on this point. Respondents are unclear as to whether solar PV panels are recyclable, and so seek clarity on this point. The removal and disposal of solar PV panels can be hazardous and costly, and there are concerns that the disposal of the components of the Proposed Development will produce more pollution. Concerns have been raised that end of life solar PV panels will not be removed and as such, respondents are "visualising fields left with solar panels piled up in the countryside".	As stated in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref MW-D1), the Proposed Development will aim to prioritise waste prevention, by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy. Furthermore, to reduce the potential impacts from materials and waste, and to achieve high levels of sustainability in The Proposed Development as a whole, the Principal Contractor will apply the principles of the waste hierarchy and adopt best practice measures (BPM) which go beyond statutory compliance. This may include BPMs set out in construction industry guidance for example, guidance from the Considerate Constructors Scheme, Waste & Resources Action Programme and CIRIA. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The anticipated waste streams during decommissioning are set out in Table 14-7 Estimated Decommissioning Waste within ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**. With the embedded mitigation measures in place, the overall quantities of decommissioning waste to be disposed of to landfill are anticipated to be below 1% of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity and less than 0.1% of national hazardous landfill capacity. The assessment concludes that significant waste effects are not expected during decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The WEEE Regulations 2013 (as amended) and The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (as amended) place obligations on the "producer" (such as the manufacturers, importers or brand owners) who place solar PV panels on the market to finance the costs of collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal; and the landfill tax strongly incentivise reuse, recycling and recovery. The definition of a producer and their obligations are outlined in the WEEE Regulations 2013 (as amended). As outlined in Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]** Section 14.5 Materials and Waste, paragraph 14.5.88 *"The UK company SolRecycle reports a recovery rate of 95% for solar PV Panels"*. As outlined in paragraph 14.5.91 *"It is assumed that specialist regional or national facilities would be in place at the time of component replacement and decommissioning, and these would be developed in response to demand generated by the UK-wide solar PV panel industry and waste components would be reused, recycled, or recovered and not disposed of to landfill."* At present, solar PV panel waste generation is low, therefore there is a limited demand for facilities that recycle this infrastructure and there is therefore associated limited available capacity. It is a new, emerging market but the Applicant is aware of 5 UK facilities that currently recycle solar panels. These facilities report 95-99% recovery rates following recent investment, which is an improvement on what the market was achieving in the last few years. For example, Solar Recycling Solutions (SRS) states on its website that its London based recycling plan achieves a 99% material recovery rate currently. It is expected that the facilities which reuse, recycle, or recover end of-life solar PV panels will continue to expand (and new companies emerge) as the quantities of this waste stream increase. The landfill tax strongly incentivises reuse, recycling and recovery, but critically the WEEE Regulations 2013 (as amended) and the Waste Batteries and Accumulators (Amendment)

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning
			Regulations 2009 place obligations on those who place solar PV panels and batteries on the market to finance the costs of collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal, whilst also requiring a minimum 90% recovery rate. As noted above, it is expected that the current market would expand to improve this.
RR-139, RR-263	Disposal Following Decommissioning	Concerns regarding the decommissioning, removal and disposal of the redundant equipment. The application does not appear to provide explicit detail around disposal. At the very least I feel there should be some baseline guarantee that, if necessary, the equipment would be sent to landfill. Although this is far from ideal it provides at least some reassurances that the full costs for landfill and the gate fees, including special waste, are included in the project economics, are fully transparent and held in some form of escrow. Given the significant gate this should help incentivise the developer / operator to secure lower-cost alternatives?	As stated in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref MW-D1), the Proposed Development will aim to prioritise waste prevention, by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy. Furthermore, to reduce the potential impacts from materials and waste, and to achieve high levels of sustainability in The Proposed Development as a whole, the Principal Contractor will apply the principles of the waste hierarchy and adopt best practice measures which go beyond statutory compliance. This may include BPMs set out in construction industry guidance for example, guidance from the Considerate Constructors Scheme, Waste & Resources Action Programme and Construction Industry Research and Information Association. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The anticipated waste streams during decommissioning are set out in Table 14-7 Estimated Decommissioning Waste within ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**. With the embedded mitigation measures in place, the overall quantities of decommissioning waste to be disposed of to landfill are anticipated to be below 1% of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity and less than 0.1% of national hazardous landfill capacity. The assessment concludes that significant waste effects are not expected during decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013 (as amended) and The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (as amended) place obligations on the “producer” (such as the manufacturers, importers or brand owners) who place solar PV panels and batteries on the market to finance the costs of collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal; and the landfill tax strongly incentivise reuse, recycling and recovery. The definition of a producer and their obligations are outlined in the WEEE Regulations 2013 (as amended). The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, which is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which provides that decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, it will be decommissioned in line with the controls set out within the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (the provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), with the land reinstated to its original quality, and returned to the landowners who would choose how the land is to be used and managed. It should be noted that the breach of any commitments under a DCO amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority. Regarding the comment that reassurances that the full costs for landfill and the gate fees, including special waste, are included in the project economics, the Applicant does not consider a restoration bond to be necessary or proportionate. Funding for restoration of land is not required to be secured under the Planning Act 2008, nor is the Applicant aware of any guidance requiring this in the NPSs or otherwise. Given that decommissioning of the Proposed Development is adequately controlled by virtue of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** the

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning
			Applicant considers that any further requirement would be a duplication of existing controls potentially creating confusion. The production of a detailed DEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Given the legally binding obligation to carry out decommissioning works, including the funding of the same, the provision of a restoration bond is not justified.
RR-028	Decommissioning Costs / Funding Statement	The Funding Statement should identify the costs of decommissioning and how they will be met. The £340 million referred to in the Funding Statement does not include decommissioning costs. After the 60 year period for the project, it is highly unlikely that the Applicant would still have any legal or operational interest in the application site and it may well be that the only legal entity with such an interest in the land is insolvent. It would therefore fall to North Kesteven District Council to fund the remedial work which would likely run into millions of pounds and which there may be little prospect of being able to recover. In order to ensure that the decommissioning and restoration works are not carried at public expense, the DCO should include a requirement that the Applicant provide an on-demand index-linked performance bond to North Kesteven District Council to secure the performance of the decommissioning obligations set out in the Draft DCO.	The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development, which is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, which provides that decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, it will be decommissioned in line with the controls set out within the DEMP **[APP-191]** (the provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), with the land reinstated to its original quality, and returned to the landowners who would choose how the land is to be used and managed. It should be noted that the breach of any commitments under a DCO amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority. The Applicant does not consider a restoration bond to be necessary or proportionate. Funding for restoration of land is not required to be secured under the Planning Act 2008, nor is the Applicant aware of any guidance requiring this in the NPSs or otherwise. Given that decommissioning of the Proposed Development is adequately controlled by virtue of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** the Applicant considers that any further requirement would be a duplication of existing controls potentially creating confusion. The production of a detailed DEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Given the legally binding obligation to carry out decommissioning works, including the funding of the same, the provision of a restoration bond is not justified.
RR-016, RR-027, RR-043, RR-085, RR-087, RR-092, RR-095, RR-115, RR-136, RR-147, RR-160, RR-192, RR-228, RR-245, RR-246, RR-249, RR-269, RR-279, RR-281	Decommissioning Responsibility	After the proposed 40/60 years who will be responsible for removing the panels AND the underground structures to return it to farmland? This will be a problem for the grandchildren of present landowners. Who is going to address/manage decommissioning concerns? Who will be responsible for reinstating the land and drainage systems? Who will bear the costs of getting the land back to arable? Who would be responsible for cleaning up the land when the project comes to the end of its life and how will this be financed/enforced, given that the owner/operator could just decide to cease trading before they were required to clean up? Concern for burden on the local community and council if the Applicant became insolvent and any future recovery work would be at the public expense. No provision is made for the cost of restoring the land after forty years, my guess is that many will go into liquidation just prior to that and the state will have to pay as usual. This will become a problem for the grandchildren of the present owners and I understand that at present the panels are not recyclable. The disposal of infrastructure once exceeded use – problem for next generation.	Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of its operating life the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. Any material change of use would require planning permission. The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** submitted with the DCO application sets out the principles and measures to be followed in the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. As set out in paragraph 2.2.1 of the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, the Principal Contractor, appointed by the Applicant, will be responsible for the decommissioning works. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework DEMP, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.This ensures that the decommissioning works will be undertaken in line with the measures secured within the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**. It should also be noted that breach of any commitments under a Development Consent Order amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority. The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (see Section 2.2) sets out the key roles and responsibilities during the decommissioning phase for the various personnel.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning
		Who will pay, the Energy Company or will it be NKDC, the Taxpayers?	With regards to demonstrating that the land can be restored to its former agricultural use following decommissioning of the Proposed Development, the Framework SMP **[AS-100]** sets out measures to be taken to ensure that the soil is protected and is able to revert back to its former condition. This includes the maintenance of soils (ref. section 6.9) and the implementation of a monitoring schedule to be undertaken and set out within the detailed SMP. The provision of a detailed SMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured by Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Decommissioning of the Proposed Development and restoration/reinstatement of the land back to its former condition after 60 years is required and secured via Requirement 20 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). As stated in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref MW-D1), the Proposed Development will aim to prioritise waste prevention, by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy. Furthermore, to reduce the potential impacts from materials and waste, and to achieve high levels of sustainability in The Proposed Development as a whole, the Principal Contractor will apply the principles of the waste hierarchy and adopt best practice measures (BPM) which go beyond statutory compliance. This may include BPMs set out in construction industry guidance for example, guidance from the Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS), Waste & Resources Action Programme (WRAP) and Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA). The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The comment regarding “who will pay the Energy Company or will be the NKDC, the Taxpayers” is not understood.
RR-175, RR-176, RR-249	Decommissioning Uncertainty	The operational lifespan of the project is unclear and there is the possibility of the land becoming a brown field site for development after decommission, rather that reverting to agricultural use. It remains unclear what the status of the land would be after the solar farm is decommissioned. Would it return to farmland or would it now be classified as brownfield? This needs to be firmly established now before any detailed consideration of planning is done.	Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational life of the Proposed Development, land will be reinstated to its current quality and returned to the landowners who would then choose how the land is to be used and managed. Any material change of use would require planning permission. The Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** submitted with the DCO Application sets out the principles and measures to be followed in the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. It should be noted that the breach of the terms of a DCO amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority.
RR-087, RR-120	No Binding Requirement for Decommissioning	No binding mechanism is in place to ensure full reinstatement of soils, hedgerows, and drainage systems at the end of the project’s life.	The SMP **[AS-100]** sets out measures to be taken to ensure that the soil is protected and is able to revert back to its former condition. This includes the maintenance of soils (ref. section 6.9) and the implementation of a monitoring schedule to be undertaken and set out within the detailed SMP. This provision of a detailed SMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Under this Requirement, the detailed SMP is to be submitted to NKDC (as the relevant LPA) for approval and must be implemented as approved. Decommissioning of the Proposed Development and restoration/reinstatement of the land back to its former condition after 60 years is required and secured in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed,

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Decommissioning
			substantially in accordance with the framework plan, under Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). It should be noted that the breach of any commitments under a DCO amounts to a criminal offence and the provisions and Requirements of a DCO are enforceable by the Local Planning Authority. With regards to drainage systems, the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.4) notes: *"the drainage of the land within the Proposed Development will be checked and grassed after decommissioning. Should any agricultural drains be altered or removed, they will be restored such that agricultural activities could continue after decommissioning of the Proposed Development."* With regards to hedgerows, these will be managed in accordance with the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** – for example, (ref. paragraph 5.2.9) existing hedgerows will be managed to enhance biodiversity and improve ecosystem services, whilst also increasing screening for visual receptors. This will involve filling gaps and thickening hedgerows with a broader range of native species, where needed. As noted in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5), areas of habitat and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement, as well as permissive paths delivered as part of the Proposed Development, would remain up until the Proposed Development is decommissioned. Following this, the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. The provision of a detailed LEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

7.18 General Public: Public Rights of Way

Table 7-18: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way
RR-007, RR-015, RR-017, RR-027, RR-028, RR-029, RR-041, RR-059, RR-086, RR-087, RR-093, RR-094, RR-098, RR-100, RR-120, RR-123, RR-139, RR-141, RR-149, RR-155, RR-171, RR-175, RR-183, RR-189, RR-198, RR-213, RR-222, RR-229, RR-245, RR-249, RR-263, RR-267, RR-268, RR-279, RR-290, RR-291	Impact on PRoWs and Recreational Walking Routes	Concerns that the enjoyment of PRoWs and local footpaths will be negatively impacted due to the presence of solar panels and high fences creating an impression of being "enclosed". There are concerns that this will lead to a loss of recreational value both for local residents, and for visitors. There are also concerns in relation to the impact on the 'Stepping Out' series of leisure walks which has been promoted by NKDC.	The Applicant recognises the amenity value of the site and its surroundings, in particular the importance of PRoWs to local residents, and has sought to enhance local connectivity through sensitive design. The Applicant has designed the Proposed Development to create links that integrate with existing and proposed routes to support cycling and pedestrian access to benefit local amenity value and will avoid the closure of PRoWs wherever practicably possible. Details are provided in the Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** a detailed version of which will be developed, substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured by Requirement 18 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Potential impacts on Public Rights of Way are assessed in Chapter 12: Socio-economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**. There are 36 PRoW and seven permissive paths located within the Principal Site, as well as 26 PRoW which run alongside the Order Limits or are within close proximity to the Principal Site. Furthermore, there are five PRoW which could be impacted by the Cable Corridor. The Proposed Development would require the permanent diversion of three PRoW, with minimal changes in journey length experienced by users, and each of which is assessed to result in a negligible effect, which is considered not significant. Some PRoW may need to be temporarily closed to facilitate the safe construction of the Proposed Development. Where a PRoW is proposed for temporary closure, a diversion route has been proposed for the duration of the closure, with the original PRoW to be fully reinstated upon completion of the relevant works. The Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]** show each proposed temporary PRoW closure, as well as the corresponding proposed indicative location of temporary PRoW diversion. The Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** outlines how the Applicant will PRoW within the Order Limits to ensure they have been suitably considered and will continue to operate effectively throughout the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** reviews both user safety and accessibility, during the complete life cycle of the Proposed Development, considering the potential interaction and impact on the PRoW associated with the construction works, as well as the day-to-day operation of the Proposed Development. Visual impacts on the PRoW network have been considered in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the ES **[AS-117]**. The siting of solar PV panels and associated infrastructure seeks to minimise instances of development on both sides of PRoW. Fencing around the Order Limits will be a 'stock proof fence' (i.e., wooden posts and metal wire mesh) and will be up to 2m in height. Palisade fencing will only be utilised around the perimeter of the BESS compounds (Work No. 2 and 3), and the Onsite Substation (Work No. 4) and will be up to 2.5m in height and painted in a muted colour sympathetic to the surrounding environment. Where development is proposed adjacent to a PRoW, there will be a minimum offset of 10m from the centre line (minimum 20m total). Where development is proposed on both sides of a PRoW, sections of wider offsets reflecting local features, such as hedgerows, will be integrated to vary the extent of views experienced across the Principal Site, where practicable. These buffers are secured by Requirement 6: Detailed design approval as set out in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Additionally, as noted in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]** (ref. paragraph 6.1.4), to be secured by Requirement 8 and 17 under Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, a permissive path

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way
			network, totalling approximately 9.5km, will be implemented providing routes across the Principal Site and enhancing the recreational value of the Order Limits (see Figure 3-3 Proposed Permissive Path Plan of the ES **[AS-024]** and the Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** for further details). These will supplement the existing PRoW network, linking together existing walking routes, increasing connectivity and creating enhanced connections to surrounding villages. The proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, providing more effective linkages across the site. These permissive paths include: new connections around Cathedral Park; a new connection at Tunman Wood; a new connection at Thurlby; and a new circular route to the west of Bassingham. These permissive paths are secured in Requirement 17: Permissive paths and Requirement 8: Landscape and ecological management plan as set out in the Draft DCO **[APP-016]** and secured in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]**.
RR-017	Impact on Safety of PRoW	How much thought has been given to safety of local public footpaths and rights of way.	The importance of maintaining safe public access to PRoWs is fully appreciated by the Applicant. The Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** reviews both user safety and accessibility, during the complete life cycle of the Proposed Development, considering the potential interaction and impact on the PRoWs associated with the construction works, as well as the day-to-day operation of the Proposed Development. The PRoWs will be managed throughout the construction phase to ensure that existing routes can continue to be used safely throughout the duration of the proposed works. Existing widths will be maintained for all PRoW throughout the construction phase. The Principal Contractor would implement the following management measures in accordance with the Framework PRoWMP **[APP-195]** in order to ensure that members of the public can continue to use PRoWs in a safe manner, during the construction phase. These management measures include: • Physical PRoW separation from construction routes and works – where necessary, PRoW will be physically separated from the proposed construction routes and works areas in order to maximise the safety of members of the public utilising the PRoW. Mesh, Heras, or other similar types of fencing will be used to create this physical separation. Where physical separation is not feasible, banksmen will be used to segregate motor vehicles from other PRoW users through management of vehicle movements. The PRoW where such measures will be implemented are denoted on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]** as 'Shared use of PRoW'; and • Minimal management works – short-term measures such as signage or fencing may be required for any PRoW which joins another PRoW which will be managed and physically separated from proposed construction routes and works areas as detailed above. It is important that public safety is maintained when construction vehicles utilise routes within the Order Limits. All proposed vehicular crossing points over PRoW/managed use of PRoW will be carefully controlled with various measures implemented to allow all users to pass through safely. Such measures may include, but are not limited to: • Site fencing and crossing gates; • Monitoring at the busiest locations when crossing points are in use; and • Signage at the crossing points themselves, as well as on approach to provide advance warning of the potential presence of construction vehicles and PRoW users.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Public Rights of Way
			Some PRoW may need to be temporarily closed to facilitate the safe construction of the Proposed Development. Where a PRoW is proposed for temporary closure, a diversion route has been proposed for the duration of the closure, with the original PRoW to be fully reinstated upon completion of the relevant works. The Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans **[AS-106]** show each proposed temporary PRoW closure, as well as the corresponding proposed indicative location of temporary PRoW diversion. During the decommissioning phase, it is anticipated that the PRoW will be managed in a similar manner to the construction phase. There are not expected to be any PRoW closures, but it is likely that some minor diversions will be required to provide safe access across the Order Limits whilst decommissioning activities are taking place. These diversions are expected to be similar in nature and duration to those proposed for the construction phase.

7.19 General Public: Miscellaneous Comments

Table 7-19: Applicant's Responses to General Public Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
RR-097	Support for Proposed Development	I strongly support the proposed project. We need to end our reliance on fossil fuels and large scale solar sites are a major contributor to this. Flat land in a sparsely populated area such as the proposed site is the ideal location. To say no to it just because it is close to my house is selfish. There is a large solar site near Cranwell and goes largely unnoticed, it has no impact on me or my neighbourhood.	The Applicant welcomes the supportive representation and acknowledges the recognition of the importance of renewable energy and the suitability of the location for the Proposed Development, given the topography and rural nature of the surrounding area. The Applicant notes the example of other operational solar sites in the area and confirms that the Proposed Development has been designed to minimise ecological, landscape and visual, and amenity impacts among other environmental considerations, while integrating solar sensitively into the landscape. The Applicant appreciates the support expressed.
RR-102, RR-179	Support for Proposed Development	Completely in support of the proposal	The Applicant welcomes the supportive representation.
RR-221	Support for Proposed Development	I applaud and welcome the development as I believe it will contribute to reduced energy prices as well as reduced GHG emissions.	The Applicant welcomes the supportive representation and acknowledges the recognition of the Proposed Development's potential to contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The Proposed Development is expected to deliver a total lifetime carbon saving of approximately 3,302,906 tCO_2e relative to the grid average, with a carbon payback period of around four years, taking into account emissions from construction, transport, installation, and decommissioning. This contribution will support the UK in meeting its national and international climate targets.
RR-237	Support for Proposed Development	I think this is a good idea. Good to lessen our reliance on dirty fuels and focus on clean energy. There is still plenty of farming land for food.	The Applicant welcomes the supportive representation and acknowledges the recognition of the importance of renewable energy. The Applicant agrees with the statement regarding availability of farming land for food. The loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent. The Applicant has also sought to avoid the use of BMV land and to minimise impacts on BMV land (and ongoing agricultural operations), whereby BMV agricultural land has been carefully taken into account in the sensitive design of the Proposed Development.
RR-027, RR-096, RR-253	International Relations	The panels are to be bought from China making us dependent on them for spare parts. Solar panels are ugly, plastic and made in China. Disposal of the panels will produce more pollution as will the manufacturing and shipping most likely from China. We do agree that we have to achieve net carbon but as a person with a degree in science this fanatical commitment to solar farms is being seen a political dogma and not a balanced approach based upon the science.	At this stage the specific model of panels is not known and a supplier has not been identified. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV and battery technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Applicant be granted consent for the Proposed Development, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right solar PV and BESS for the Proposed Development. Currently over 95% of the world's panels are made in China, and therefore the carbon assessment (Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-038]**) has assumed, as a worst-case scenario that they would be made in and transported from China, although there is also potential for similar panels to be procured from Europe. Although the transport of solar panels will incur some GHG emissions, even considering this the Proposed Development will save approximately 3.3 million tonnes of CO2e. The solar panels themselves are for the majority, not made from plastic – the panels consist of a series of PV cells beneath a layer of toughened glass with an anti-reflective coating, the frame is typically built from adonised aluminium and the mounting structure will be galvanised steel frames. However, small amounts of plastic are present in some small parts of the panel such as electrical components.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
			With regards to the disposal of panels, it is anticipated that over 95% of the solar PV infrastructure will be recycled. The procurement process will only begin post-consent and during the detailed design stage, at which point detail regarding the recyclability of the infrastructure will become known. The Applicant is committed to ethical supply and has prepared a Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**. As stated in the Materials and Waste section of ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**, the Proposed Development will aim to prioritise waste prevention, by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy. The anticipated waste streams during decommissioning are set out in Table 14-7 Estimated Decommissioning Waste within ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**. With the embedded mitigation measures in place, the overall quantities of decommissioning waste to be disposed of to landfill are anticipated to be below 1% of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity and less than 0.1% of national hazardous landfill capacity. The assessment concludes that significant waste effects are not expected during decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The UK's transition to a low-carbon energy system is necessary to avoid the effects of climate change. The Government expects that a low-cost, net zero and consistent electricity system is likely to be composed predominantly of wind, solar and nuclear. The need for the Proposed Development is set out fully in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**.
RR-139, RR-263	Manufacture of Components	As this application is utilising NISP process with particular attention to the net zero agenda one would anticipate that every aspect of the project would be striving for minimising carbon footprint. It would be interesting to see environmental and financial calculations associated with the manufacturing and transportation of the solar panels & equipment being provided (given that it appears to be sourced from China). It would be interesting to understand why stipulations are not in place to insist that every component part should, by default, be manufactured locally i.e., here in the UK, or at worst in Europe as opposed to the far east. In event of go-ahead these feel like unnecessary lost economic benefits to the UK?	At this stage the specific model of panels is not known and a supplier has not been identified. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV and battery technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Applicant be granted consent for the Proposed Development, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right solar PV and BESS for the Proposed Development. Currently over 95% of the world's panels are made in China, and therefore the carbon assessment (Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-038, Section 6.4]**) has assumed, as a worst-case scenario that they would be made in and transported from China, although there is also potential for similar panels to be procured from Europe. Although the transport of solar panels will incur some GHG emissions, even considering this the Proposed Development will save approximately 3.3 million tonnes of CO2e. The Applicant is committed to responsible sourcing and ethical supply chains. This is secured through the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**. During detailed design, opportunities to procure components from UK and European suppliers will be considered where feasible and where such procurement meets technical, environmental and economic requirements.
RR-033, RR-085, RR-277	Energy Security & International Relations	Energy Security - Recent events have highlighted the lack of energy security that these type of solar projects provide. Some politicians have recently argued that the UK needs to move away from reliance on energy from foreign states to avoid our energy costs being at the mercy of international threats. For example, China has a stronghold on the supply of many of the key components (solar panels, high voltage switches etc) as well as the materials (lithium and other rare earth metals) required for the Proposed Development. This is a risk if the geostrategic environment shifts.	The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, such as the Proposed Development, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's decarbonisation and energy security needs. NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector*." Paragraph 2.10.10 of NPS EN-3 goes on to confirm that

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
		In addition, the risks associated with cyber security of the various components are also significant as increasing evidence emerges of covert software being embedded in the various chips used in the various systems that provide a communication network that is linked to this potentially hostile state. This “kill switch “ capability has been highlighted both in the US and the UK by the relevant Agencies. Given the uncertainty in the geopolitical environment it is clearly a significant risk to the UK economy if there is a significant reliance on Chinese technology and its various applications in the solar generation arena.	solar has an important role in delivering the government’s goals for greater energy independence including those of the British Energy Security Strategy, which sets out that the government expects a five-fold increase in combined ground and rooftop solar deployment by 2035 (up to 70GW).
RR-123, RR-081, RR-238	Security / Proximity to RAF Bases	The area is very close to RAF Waddington so will be a security risk. Moreover, RAF Digby is the HQ of the Joint Cyber and Electromagnetic Activities Group. Any interference with these defence estates would cause significant harm. The planes from RAF Waddington fly almost directly above the proposed high voltage cables - likewise the Red Arrows - and all the various planes which were involved in the recent Cobra Warrior exercise. The application should not be recommended due to the potential interference with the RAF bases.	The Applicant notes the concerns raised regarding proximity to RAF Waddington and RAF Digby. The Applicant acknowledges that during the assessment of alternative sites, Site 8: Scopwick Health borders RAF Digby. During the site selection process, Site 8 was removed from consideration due to its proximity to the operational airfield, Lincoln Cliff Area of Great Landscape Value, and being located on Grade 2 agricultural land. The Proposed Development, particularly the Principal Site is considered to be a sufficient distance from RAF Digby such that interferences with this MoD establishment is not anticipated. Glint and glare impacts upon military aerodromes and activity have been assessed within ES Appendix 14-D: Glint and Glare Assessment **[APP-171- APP-173]** which considers specific receptors defined by the MoD including Air Traffic Control Towers, runway approach paths and circuit paths at RAF Waddington as agreed through ongoing engagement in relation to glint and glare. The assessment concludes no significant impact is predicted upon aviation activity associated with the MoD. A SoCG with the MoD is currently being prepared (which will be submitted at the midpoint of Examination in line with the Examining Authority’s request in its Procedural Decision dated 22 August 2025 **[PD-005]**) to agree this position. The proposed solar panels will be manufactured with anti-reflective coating to optimise energy performance and to be non-reflective. There will be no overhead lines as part of the Proposed Development or Cable Corridor; these do not form part of the authorised development that is being applied for (Schedule 1 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**). All cables for onsite connections and grid export will be buried underground. The only above ground cables are those that may be attached to the rear of panels. This is secured by Requirement 6 Detailed design approval of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Applicant will continue to engage with the MoD through their SoCG and during detailed design and construction to ensure all safeguarding requirements are met, and will comply with any conditions applied by the Secretary of State to ensure operational assurance for RAF Waddington, RAF Digby and associated MoD assets.
RR-281	Security of Site	How will these sites be staffed and what security can be guaranteed as they will be very vulnerable to theft and damage leading to failure	The Applicant has designed the Proposed Development to ensure that unauthorised access is difficult to achieve and to minimise the potential for damage to occur through criminal damage. A 2 m high fence will enclose the operational areas of the Proposed Development with pole mounted inward facing CCTV systems installed at a height of up to 2.5 m. Security measures are described in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development **[APP-028]**. The Applicant is keen to avoid incidents of trespassing and will have a community liaison officer during construction and operation for the local community to contact with any concerns and issues.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
RR-235	Security of Surrounding Area	Loss of security in the Airmen's Quarters section of Witham St Hughs. (To date we have had peace and quiet, dark skies and no security issues). Already we live in a Covenant area and are subject to changes that the landowner may impose. No mention has been made (that I am aware of) regarding the landowner and his appointed agent. I live right on the furthermost edge of the area, adjacent to the Fosse Green proposed project.	The Applicant recognises local concerns regarding security, however the Proposed Development Site will be well contained - a 2m high fence will enclose the operational areas of the Proposed Development with pole mounted inward facing CCTV systems installed at a height of up to 2.5m. Security measures are described in Chapter 3: The Proposed Development **[APP-028]**. The Applicant has designed the Proposed Development to ensure that unauthorised access is difficult to achieve. The Applicant is keen to avoid incidents of trespassing and will have a community liaison officer during construction and operation for the local community to contact with any concerns and issues. With regards to lighting, as secured within the Framework OEMP **[APP-190]** (ref. LV-O3), the proposed operational lighting and CCTV has been designed to avoid adverse effects and minimise visual intrusion. The following mitigation has been embedded within the Proposed Development: • No areas of the Proposed Development will be continuously lit. • Operational lighting will be triggered by Passive Infra-red Detector (PID) systems, which will be installed around the perimeter of the Proposed Development. • Lighting will be directional with care to minimise potential for light spillage beyond the DCO Site particularly towards neighbouring properties, habitats, highways or waterways. • Lights installed will be of the minimum brightness and/or power rating capable of performing the desired function. • Light fittings will be used to reduce the amount of light emitted above the horizontal (reduce upward lighting). • The lighting of the primary substation will be motion sensor triggered, that would operate from dusk. • Low level lighting on specific operational units will be triggered by motion sensors, from dusk. • The inward facing CCTV cameras will typically use night-vision technology and will not require additional lighting. The provision of a detailed OEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Applicant has engaged with all known persons with an interest in the land, therefore the landowners for areas within the Order Limits will have been consulted from an early stage. Furthermore, as set out in the Consultation Report **[APP-023]**, the Applicant defined a Core Consultation Zone of 3 km from the site which received a direct mailing at each consultation. The Planning Inspectorate, upon receipt of the DCO Application, was required to consider whether the Applicant had carried out adequate consultation in accordance with legislative requirements. The Planning Inspectorate invited the relevant local authorities to submit an adequacy of consultation response – these can be found within the Fosse Green Energy Examination Library at AoC-001 to AoC-013. The acceptance of the DCO Application for examination confirms that it is considered that adequate and statutorily compliant consultation has been undertaken.
RR-281	Money Offered to Farmers	Amount being offered to farmers to lease their land for up to 40 years far exceeds any money they can receive for conventional farming so with that level of cost how can the electric they produce ever be cheap as there is only one customer (the grid).	As set out in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, due to technological advances, solar facilities are already among the cheapest form of electricity generation in the UK and larger solar schemes, such as the Proposed Development, deliver power more quickly and at a lower unit

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
			cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same total capacity, bringing forward carbon reduction and economic benefits in line with government policy. During operation, the Proposed Development's occupation of landowners' land, as a new diversified enterprise, will provide a new income stream, wholly independent of variations in profitability of arable production and serves to support agricultural businesses in the long-term. The Applicant does not have the power to lower local energy bills, but through the Proposed Development, would be contributing to the delivery of the government's aspiration to deliver sufficient energy for the UK market, providing energy security, which in turn has the potential to lower retail prices.
RR-087	Concerns Post Decommissioning	Long-term maintenance access rights and restrictions will continue to limit how the land can be used for generations.	The Applicant does not agree that long-term maintenance access will restrict the land for generations. The Proposed Development is temporary (60-year operational life span), whereby under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. Maintenance access will be required at times throughout the operation of the Proposed Development however will not prevent continued agricultural use, such as grassland management and grazing. Following decommissioning, as set out in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5) the land will be returned to the landowners and available for its current use, although it will be the decision of the landowners as to how they use and manage the land, without any ongoing restrictions. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-166	No Support for UK Economy	Solar equipment is being brought in from other countries so is not helping British companies or our economy either.	At this stage the final choice of solar infrastructure is not known and a supplier has not been identified. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV and battery technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Applicant receive consent, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right solar PV and BESS for the Proposed Development. The Applicant understands that The UK Government is trying to kick start manufacturing of panels in the UK and has a task force currently working on this, but historically China undercut European manufacturers leading to the closure of these factories. The same assumptions were made for BESS, although battery manufacturing facilities are already in construction in the UK, with a large facility opening in the next 2 years in Somerset for example. The Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** would, once implemented in full post-consent, seek to maximise opportunities for investing in the local supply chain and businesses that can support the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The provision of a detailed ESSCP, which would be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. Furthermore, it should be noted that the Applicant is committed to an ethical procurement process, whereby the Applicant has committed to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development being undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and has made this is a legal obligation under the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. This will be achieved through the development of a detailed ESSCP, which will

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
			be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]** submitted with the DCO application, as secured under Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-226, RR-250	International Relations	Foreign Investment We understand that £60 million is being allocated to Cameroon and West / Central to improve agricultural infrastructures in rapidly developing countries. Whilst we understand the need to promote self sufficiency in these countries, it seems rather perverse that the same attitude does not prevail for our own farmers. Furthermore part of this deal is to "demonstrate the UK's serious commitment to forging stronger trade and investment ties with Africa...". So, one could assume that we will be importing resources from abroad which we can no longer produce on prime agricultural land in our own country swathed in solar panels and that we exploit another country to further our own ends on the world stage. Both deductions are somewhat short sighted and in the case of the latter have the potential to be unethical too.	Matters relating to international development funding and trade policy are set by Government and fall outside the scope of this Application. The Proposed Development has been brought forward in accordance with national energy policy, whereby NPS EN-3 recognises solar as a Critical National Priority, and explains that projects such as the Proposed Development and this DCO Application are required to meet the United Kingdom's Net Zero Targets. Solar forms an important part of a diverse portfolio of energy generating facilities that are required in the UK; which is recognised in NPS EN-1. The Applicant recognises that there are concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon food production. As considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which allows current farming practices to continue whilst also providing other benefits, such as mitigation for ground nesting birds. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV agricultural land. Following decommissioning, as set out in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5), the land will be returned to the landowners and available for its current use, although it will be the decision of the landowners as to how they use and manage the land. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-029, RR-033	Necessity	According to the World Bank, the UK is 229th out of 230 countries for large scale solar suitability. The strategic plan for UK energy production has already indicated that there is significant overcapacity in terms of UK BESS capability as well as solar generation given that it is the least effective energy provider to the grid (only Iceland is less effective worldwide in provision of solar power). As the UK moves to an Electricity backbone not reliant on fossil fuel generation, the decarbonisation requirement is	The decarbonisation of all sectors is essential in achieving the UK's legally binding target to achieve net zero by 2050 as per the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Increasing solar generation plays a key part in this – as stated in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, paragraph 3.3.20 of NPS EN-1 recognises that solar (alongside wind) is the most cost effective of generating electricity, and that analysis shows that "*a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar*" – and is critical to the provision of adequate low-carbon electricity to meet increasing demands. Any future energy system must be resilient and affordable, and solar PV has been identified as being vital for a decarbonised grid and can support security of supply as part of a portfolio of different generation technologies, including wind and nuclear.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
		best met by Nuclear fission (Small Modular Reactors) and in the medium term by Nuclear fusion capability in which the UK leads the world in its development.	The Statement of Need **[APP-184]** further sets out the need case for the Proposed Development. In summary, renewable electricity generation is identified as being a Critical National Priority and storage (such as BESS) is identified as having a key role to play in achieving net zero - BESS is an important component of the transition to net zero and provides flexibility to the energy system, as recognised in paragraphs 3.3.25 to 3.3.27 of NPS EN-1. The proposed BESS has a direct relationship with the solar element of the Proposed Development and will support its operation by storing energy when it is generated in abundance and releasing it to the grid when it is needed, increasing the reliability of the energy system and contributing to the security of supply. This increases the efficiency of the Proposed Development as a renewable energy project aiding both its operation as a generation station and the export of electricity to the grid. If consented, the Proposed Development would contribute to achieving the UK's energy vision, as set out in both national policy and guidance. The status of the Proposed Development as a large-scale solar development with BESS will allow it to contribute to delivering net zero, support security of supply and contribute to affordability.
RR-031, RR-249	UK Security / International Relations	In the First World War, we learnt the importance of food security, and again in the Second World War, and again in the Ukraine war. Gross stupidity to cover good farmland with solar panels. Especially when the UK imports an ever increasing percentage of our food. We can survive Powergen cuts - we can't survive with no food. Can our governing bodies wake up and see the bleeding obvious. Difficulty in supply caused by covid and the continuing and escalating war in Ukraine/Eastern Europe has highlighted the UK's need for self-reliance in food security.	The Applicant recognises that there are concerns relating to the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon food production. As considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. It should be noted that the Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the framework plan, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCODCO **[APP-016]**), which allows current farming practices to continue whilst also providing other benefits, such as mitigation for ground nesting birds. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV agricultural land. Following decommissioning, as set out in the Framework DEMP **[APP-191]** (ref. paragraph 2.3.5), the land will be returned to the landowners and available for its current use, although it will be the decision of the landowners as to how they use and manage the land. The provision of a detailed DEMP, which is to be substantially in accordance with the framework plan, is secured via Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.
RR-267	Recommendations	It is recommended that: 1. All comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) be reviewed , including further consultation with residents and agricultural stakeholders instead of the mish mash of multi events from multi	1. A robust EIA has been undertaken in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, with a comprehensive ES, in accordance with the EIA Scoping Opinion (ref. Appendix 1-B EIA Scoping Opinion of the ES **[APP-119]**, submitted with the DCO Application. The ES assesses likely significant effects throughout all phases of the Proposed Development (construction, operation (including maintenance), and

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
		providers that has led to confusion of who is doing what , where and when 2. The developer provide transparent risk assessments for fire, pollution, noise, and long-term land degradation. 3. Alternative, less intrusive locations (e.g., brownfield or industrial land) be prioritised. 4. Mitigation measures and community compensation be considered should the development proceed.	decommissioning). The ES will be reviewed in detail by the Planning Inspectorate as part of the Examination of the DCO Application. With regards to the comments on consultation, the Applicant held a series of non-statutory and statutory consultation events to present information about the Proposed Development at key stages in its development. The Consultation Report **[APP-5.1]**, specifically Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 of the report, explains how the Applicant has had regard to consultation responses. Clear information was presented at non-statutory and statutory consultation events about who is responsible for the Proposed Development and on details on its location and timeline of key milestones. This information was communicated at in-person and online events, on the Proposed Development's website and in consultation documents including the information booklet. The Planning Inspectorate, upon receipt of the DCO Application, are required to consider whether the Applicant had consulted adequately and in accordance with legislative requirements. The Planning Inspectorate invited the relevant local authorities to submit an adequacy of consultation response – these can be found within the Fosse Green Energy Examination Library at AoC-001 to AoC-013. The acceptance of the DCO Application for examination confirms that it is considered that adequate and compliant consultation has been undertaken. 2. Regarding transparent risk assessments, this has been provided within the relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement submitted with the DCO Application – Chapter 14 Other Environmental Topics of the ES **[APP-039]** (ref. Section 14.6 Major Accidents and Disasters) considers the potential effects of the Proposed Development associated with fire risk; Chapter 9 Water Environment of the ES **[APP-034]** considers the potential effects of the Proposed Development in relation to pollution of the water environment; Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the ES **[APP-036]** considers the potential effects of the Proposed Development in relation to noise; and Chapter 12 Socio Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]** considers the potential effects of the Proposed Development in relation to the use of the land (i.e. removal from agricultural use). Each assessment clearly sets out the relevant consultation (for example with statutory bodies) undertaken with regards to the respective technical topic, a clear description of the impact assessment methodology (including the receptors considered in the assessment), the baseline conditions (including the findings of survey work undertaken), embedded mitigation and mitigation measures secured by the relevant management plans (such as the Framework CEMP **[APP-189]**), and an assessment of the potential likely significant effects associated with the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development, and a cumulative assessment of the Proposed Development in combination with relevant cumulative schemes. 3. With regards to exploring the scope to non-agricultural land (such as brownfield sites or industrial land) for development, Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** sets out how previously developed land was considered. The brownfield land registers were consulted for land within the boundaries of NKDC, South Kesteven District Council, East Lindsey District Council, West Lindsey District Council and the City of Lincoln Council, which fell into the area of search. The search found three brownfield sites within the search area that were 1ha (2.47 acres) and above in size. Sites smaller than 1 ha (2.47 acres) were discounted due to their inability to provide a viable land parcel of 40 ha (99 acres), either individually or when combined with other brownfield sites. The Applicant identified 40ha (99 acres) as this is the size that would constitute one circuit at the chosen Medium Voltage of 33kV for the Proposed Development which would avoid the need for splitting circuits between smaller parcels involving a higher environmental impact for more interconnecting cables and avoids the need for more third party land. Of the sites over 1ha (2.47 acres) in size, none of the sites were large enough to

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
			provide a viable land parcel of at least 40ha (99 acres), therefore no individual brownfield site from the register provided an adequate area to facilitate a large-scale solar project over 50MW. Furthermore, two of the three sites have planning permission for residential development or for residential/mixed use development. Table 5-1 of Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** detailed these sites and Figure 7 showed these sites on a plan. The search of PDL identified no land of sufficient size to facilitate a large-scale solar project either individually or in combination with other sites. In conclusion, no suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such as solar on brownfield land has an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on its own, solar on brownfield land is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. 4. With regards to mitigation measures and community compensation, it should be noted that, should the Proposed Development be consented, the Applicant will provide a community fund providing a sum of £400 per MW per year of export capacity. Whilst this does not form part of the DCO application and does not comprise a benefit in the context of the planning balance, it does comprise a benefit of the Proposed Development to the wider community. This community benefit fund would be able to be utilised for local projects and causes, to be determined by the local community. The Applicant believes those communities living closest to the Proposed Development should benefit from it – with these communities being best placed to recommend what a 'community benefit' should be. Suggestions to date have included funding towards improvements to existing community facilities, such as village halls and sports facilities, provision of electrical vehicle charging points, subsidised solar PV panels for community use and lower cost energy, grants for broadband and wider improvements, educational visits and wider education/apprenticeship opportunities. Furthermore, the Applicant recognises the need for local people to benefit from the proposals, where this has been thoroughly considered throughout the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development, with input from the local community shaping the final design of the Proposed Development. For example, the proposed permissive path network has evolved following feedback at the statutory consultation stage, as explained in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**, to maximise community benefits and provide more effective linkages across the site. As set out in the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, once the Proposed Development is operational there will be approximately 9.5 km of new permissive paths created (to be secured by Requirement 8 and Requirement 17 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), as well as the provision of 1.8 ha (4.4 acres) of new community orchard (to be secured by Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**) with open access

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
			within the landscaping designs. Other wider benefits are detailed in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**, including energy security, decarbonisation, ecological enhancements (including significant biodiversity net gain), employment generation and economic benefits.
RR-192	Ineffective Assessment	There is no proper cradle to grave environmental impact assessment.	The Proposed Development is a NSIP and therefore as part of the DCO Application, a full EIA has been undertaken, documented within an ES. The EIA has been undertaken in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and the ES is submitted in full with the DCO Application. As set out in Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]** (ref. Section 5.3), the ES has adopted a 'Rochdale Envelope' approach to ensure a robust assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development, in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: The Rochdale Envelope[40]. This involves assessing the maximum (and where relevant, minimum) parameters, including for limits of deviation (e.g., development extents or specific maximum heights) as relevant, for the elements of the Proposed Development where flexibility needs to be retained, recognising that the worst-case parameter for one technical assessment may differ from another. Furthermore, the ES has had due consideration of the full lifetime of the Proposed Development (see Section 5.8: Temporal Scope of Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology of the ES **[APP-030]**); assessing the potential likely significant effects throughout all phases of the Proposed Development; from construction, through its operational lifetime (including maintenance), and following its decommissioning. An EIA Scoping Report **[APP-118]** was prepared and submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, whose Scoping Opinion **[APP-119]** informed the subsequent scope of the EIA. This was followed by the preparation of a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which was made available during statutory consultation. The Proposed Development design has evolved in response to that consultation and to ongoing engagement with stakeholders and technical consultees. In summary, the ES provides a comprehensive assessment of likely significant effects across all phases of the Proposed Development, in line with National Policy, Guidance and Legislation. Where environmental effects have been identified, mitigation measures are clearly set out and secured through the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**.

[40] Planning Inspectorate (2018). Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (version 3)

RR-058, RR-081, RR-144, RR-161, RR-192, RR-222, RR-251, RR-284	Manufacture of Panels	Use of Chinese forced labour, where will the panels be sourced from? The argument in favour of solar farms is that they save on using fossils fuels which, it is argued, are solely responsible for climate change yet any solar panels used will have been manufactured in China using slave labour and fossil fuels! the production of the solar panels and the batteries will I'm sure have environmental drawbacks long term as it requires significant energy, often from fossil fuels. There are significant issues around the mining, processing and use of polysilicon, the coal fired power used by the solar PV manufacturing process, global shipping impact and especially the end of life (of the panels) disposal. Confidence in the Supply Chain: Why has the Applicant not declared which manufacturers in China will produce their components? What processes is the Applicant going to employ to guarantee there is no slave labour involved throughout the entire supply chain? It is the Applicant's responsibility; in order for the ExA to have total confidence in no slave labour involvement, the Applicant needs to declare any manufacturers from regions of the world where slave labour could potentially be practiced	The specific model of solar PV and BESS that will be used for the Proposed Development has not yet been chosen, but it is acknowledged that most solar panels are made in China. This approach is common for developments of this kind, as solar PV and battery technologies are constantly evolving and new efficiencies are developed regularly. Should the Applicant receive consent, it would carry out a comprehensive audit to identify the right solar PV and BESS for the Proposed Development. When doing so, the Applicant will treat the need to ensure an ethical supply chain with the utmost importance and is fully committed to the responsible and ethical procurement of all its equipment. The procurement strategy for the Proposed Development will also reflect the aim of maximising benefits to local businesses, balanced against ensuring competitive delivery of the Proposed Development. In order to ensure an ethical procurement process, the Applicant wishes to ensure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development is undertaken pursuant to an ethical procurement policy and that this is a legal obligation under the DCO. This will be achieved through the development of a detailed ESSCP, which will be substantially in accordance with the Framework ESSCP, as will be secured under Requirement 19 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**. The Framework ESSCP includes a commitment that any qualifying supplier must participate in a modern slavery supplier due diligence exercise, and the supplier must publish annually a slavery and human trafficking statement that meets the statutory requirements of Section54 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015. Further details regarding ethical and environmental responsibilities are provided in the Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**. Recurrent Energy's parent company, Canadian Solar Inc., listed on NASDAQ in 2006, reports regularly on its commitment to several environmental, social, and governance factors, including its commitment to responsible and ethical business practices. The Applicant is also committed to responsible land use and believes the development and delivery of a large-scale solar energy and storage park can be achieved in harmony with its surroundings. The carbon assessment (Chapter 6: Climate Change of the ES **[APP-038, Section 6.4]**) has assumed, as a worst-case that they would be made in and transported from China, although there is also potential for similar panels to be procured from Europe. Although the transport of solar panels will incur some GHG emissions, even considering this the Proposed Development will provide an overall lifetime carbon saving, relative to the counterfactual grid average of the current (2025) energy mix, of approximately 3.3 million tonnes of CO_2e. With regards to the disposal of panels, over 95% of the solar PV infrastructure can be recycled but it is not known by the Applicant how much of the infrastructure will be made from recycled materials. The procurement process will only begin after consent and during detailed design stage, at which stage this level of detail may become known. The Applicant is committed to ethical supply and has prepared a Framework ESSCP **[APP-197]**. As stated in the Materials and Waste section of ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**, the Proposed Development will aim to prioritise waste prevention, by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy. The anticipated waste streams during decommissioning are set out in Table 14-7 Estimated Decommissioning Waste within ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics **[APP-039]**. With the embedded mitigation measures in place, the overall quantities of decommissioning waste to be disposed of to landfill are anticipated to be below 1% of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity and less than 0.1% of national hazardous landfill capacity. The assessment concludes that significant waste effects are not expected during decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
RR-073, RR-160, RR-170, RR-249	Excess of Solar Farms	How can another solar farm in an area that already potentially has 5/6 solar farms. The Proposed Development is unnecessary given the number of solar/BESS already planned. Solar energy is better suited to reducing demand on the grid rather than adding power to the grid - think of every domestic and commercial rooftop supplied with solar panels to provide individual premises with as much of their own power as possible. Already this year the grid has been over supplied with solar power and existing solar farms have had to be compensated for being forced to switch off. We don't need any more solar farms!	As set out in Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3), *"The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector".* The site selection process identified the location of the Proposed Development due to its suitability for solar infrastructure, the availability of a grid connection, appraisal of planning and environmental constraints and willing landowners. As detailed in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**, the Applicant recognises that energy alternatives such decentralised energy generation on roof tops or brownfield land for example, have an important role to play in decarbonisation. However, on their own, smaller scale solar, including solar on brownfield land, are not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. The Government recognises in the overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) that growth in large-scale solar schemes, alongside smaller schemes of solar or other renewable energy sources, is expected to improve the dependability of those assets as a combined portfolio, contributing to an adequate and dependable UK generation mix required to meet the UK's energy security needs, and the decarbonisation needs of the UK. Whilst brownfield solar and other smaller scale energy schemes are likely to contribute to decarbonisation, large-scale solar is still an essential part of the future electricity system, that must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where land is available and suitable, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with NPS EN-1. Paragraph 2.10.29 of the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (NPS EN-3) states that while land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location, preference should be given to using brownfield and non-agricultural land. These land types were identified within the area of search by checking the local authority brownfield register and drawing on local knowledge. No suitable areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale were found within a viable search area of the point of connection at the proposed National Grid Substation near Navenby. Furthermore, by co-locating battery energy storage systems (BESS) with solar PV, the Proposed Development has sought to maximise the benefits of the renewable energy generated by the Proposed Development. BESS enables time-shifting of solar output, absorbing energy when generation exceeds demand and discharging it during system peaks in demand. This reduces curtailment, increases utilisation of solar capacity, and can provide ancillary services to the power grid. Further information is provided in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]**.
RR-222	Excess of BESS	The targeted BESS storage capacity in the UK is already being achieved. To quote Tyler Parkes (Planning Consultants) letter to Redditch Borough Council (Planning Application 25/00628/FUL) dated 9 July 2025, "… the applicant's core arguments rest on the premise that additional BESS capacity is urgently needed to meet national targets needed to meet Net-Zero. However, analysis of the Government's own REPD **[Renewable Energy Planning Database]** statistics,……. clearly demonstrate that the targeted level of need is already being surpassed both nationally and regionally, which must undermine and weigh against the current application. In short, the	Battery storage will play a key role in transitioning to net zero with the additional storage capacity also benefitting the wider electricity system. The Planning Statement **[AS-098]** and Statement of Need **[APP-184]** both discuss the supporting planning policy for co locating a BESS with solar PV and highlight the ability of this combination to support the National Electricity Transmission System. The inclusion of a BESS will be a major contributing factor to not only in terms of the success of the Proposed Development by avoiding surplus electricity generation on peak sunny days to be stored rather than wasted, but also in its ability to support the wider Electricity System by importing electricity when there is excess electricity in the National Electricity Transmission System and exporting it when it is most needed.

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
		claimed need does not exist!" Therefore, this BESS is not required as any other existing BESS in the country can serve the same purpose in providing short-term balancing of the Grid. (Of note, the same Applicant is looking to develop the BESS to the South of Green Man Road, Navenby). 4.2 The Applicant states "As the lifetime generation figure of the BESS is significantly less than that of the Proposed Development, it is reasonable to assume that the battery will only store and discharge energy generated by the Proposed Development." If the BESS will only store and discharge energy generated by the Proposed Development, it will not import from the grid.	The BESS element of the Proposed Development supports operation by storing energy when it is generated in abundance and releasing it to the grid when it is needed (peak demand, when prices may also be higher), increasing the reliability of the energy system and contributing to the security of supply. Additionally, the BESS will help to support the grid through grid balancing mechanisms, due to the ability to import power from the grid. The main purpose of the BESS is to increase the operational efficiency of the solar PV panels by ensuring that energy generated can be stored when demand is low.
RR-136, RR-152, RR-204, RR-253, RR-280	Insignificant Contribution to UK Energy Requirements	Unconvinced that the ecological cost of production of solar panels justifies the rather insignificant contribution to this countries energy needs. The planned installation, whilst large in size will not make a significant impact on the UK's energy requirements. In order to make an impact the scale of the project needs to be larger, and placed offshore. While renewable energy is essential, the current approach risks covering vast areas of productive land with installations that, in many cases, do not yield sufficient electricity to justify the environmental and agricultural impact. There is no need for the Proposed Development and so it is a waste of money.	The UK Government has committed to achieving Net Zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 under the Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended). Solar generation plays a vital role in this transition. According to the Seventh Carbon Budget, over 60% of emissions reductions required between now and 2050 must come from electrification and low-carbon electricity production, enabling a rapid shift toward clean electricity and the electrification of other sectors such as transport and heating. Large-scale solar is an essential part of this shift. It is a proven, scalable technology capable of rapid deployment with minimal environmental impact and low operational emissions. As the UK decarbonises its economy, demand for electricity is projected to double by 2040. With the Clean Power Target of 45- 47 GW of solar generation capacity by 2030, and 45-69 GW by 2035, largescale projects such as the Proposed Development will be crucial to meeting this benchmark. As an essential component of the future electricity system, large-scale solar must be deployed where there is the natural resource, where suitable land is available, and in proximity to available grid connection locations, such as the area local to the Proposed Development, in line with the overarching NPS EN-1. As set out in NPS EN-1 paragraph 3.3.19, it states *"given the changing nature of the energy landscape, we need a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure to come forward, so that we can deliver a secure, reliable, affordable, and net zero consistent system during the transition to 2050 for a wide range of demand, decarbonisation, and technology scenarios".* NPS EN-3 sets out specific policy for solar development, recognising solar as a Critical National Priority (CNP). Paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 states that "*The government has committed to sustained growth in solar capacity to ensure that we are on a pathway that allows us to meet net zero emissions by 2050. As such, solar is a key part of the government's strategy for low-cost decarbonisation of the energy sector*." Regarding the comment that the Proposed Development will cover vast areas of productive land, this has been carefully considered through the site selection process (as set out in Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]**) and also through the sensitive design of the Proposed Development in order to minimise the impact on BMV land and agricultural operations. Appendix A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** demonstrates how the Applicant assessed the site against other potential alternative sites to ensure it was the most suitable, taking into account operational requirements, national and local planning policy and planning and environmental constraints, including the consideration of the loss of BMV agricultural land. The Design Approach Document **[APP-186]** then explains the design vision and principles that were developed at an early stage to provide a framework for design evolution. Design Principle 2 as detailed in Section 3.9 of the Design Approach Document **[APP-186]**, relates to being sensitive to existing agricultural land and reducing development on BMV land. As set out in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use of the ES **[AS-016]**, the

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
			permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the Proposed Development relates to the permanent loss of 1.5ha of Grade 3a land to ecological enhancements, which is noted as likely to be beneficial to the soil resource, although it is acknowledged that the magnitude of impact relates to the withdrawal of land from agricultural production, and therefore is established as a minor adverse effect. It is also important to note that the loss of agricultural production on the land as a result of the Proposed Development would not be permanent. The Applicant is applying for a 60-year operational period for the Proposed Development. Under Requirement 20 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**, decommissioning works must commence no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning. At the end of the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development, the land will be available for its current use, although the landowners would choose how the land is to be used and managed. It should be noted that the Proposed Development has also been designed recognising the need to allow current farming practices to continue where possible. The Order Limits include a significant portion of retained arable land (a minimum of 181ha (447.3 acres) of retained arable land is secured via the Framework LEMP **[AS-122]**, a detailed version of which is to be developed substantially in accordance with the Framework LEMP, as secured under Requirement 8 of the Draft DCO **[APP-016]**), which provides mitigation for ground nesting birds whilst also allowing current farming practices to continue. This retained arable land includes approximately 116ha (286.6 acres) of Subgrade 3a BMV land. Furthermore, as considered in Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use **[AS-016]**, the total land area required for the Proposed Development represents approximately 0.09% of the total farmland within the East Midlands, and therefore constitutes a very small proportion of the regional agricultural resource. Furthermore, research undertaken by the Applicant in 2024 indicates approximately 50% of the land within the proposed Principal Site is currently used for the cultivation of non-food crops. Of this, the majority (approximately 81%) is grown for use as fuels for carbon-intensive energy sources, rather than for direct human or animal consumption. As such, while the land is agricultural in character, its current use does not solely support food production. The Proposed Development would therefore result in a limited and proportionate change in land use, set against the wider regional context and the Proposed Development's contribution to cleaner energy generation. Regarding the comment that there is no need for the Proposed Development, as set out in the Statement of Need **[APP-184]** for the Proposed Development (and as noted above), solar generation is a critical part of the UK's strategy to achieve net zero by 2050 and is a key step towards the UK Government's objective of reducing the carbon intensity of grid electricity to well below 50 g CO2e/kWh by 2030, as described in its Clean Power 2030 (CP2030) Action Plan. The Proposed Development is required to support the delivery of the UK's legally binding emissions reduction targets, while maintaining national security of supply, improving the overall affordability of the energy system, and providing value for money to end-use consumers.
RR-222	Application Documents	It would be expected that discussion regarding 'Alternatives' would be confined to Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution. This is not the case; ES Non-Technical Summary covers 'Site Selection, Alternatives and Design Evolution', and the Planning Statement also cover Alternatives. This is one example of many which suggests the	The Applicant acknowledges that alternatives are discussed in several parts of the application as explained below. In accordance with Regulation 14(d) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Applicant is required to provide:

RR Ref No.	Theme	Summary of Comments from Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments	Response to Relevant Representations relating to Miscellaneous Comments
		Applicant intends to make it as difficult as possible for the reader to follow the documentation.	*"a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the applicant, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment;"* Accordingly, the description of the reasonable alternatives studied is provided in Chapter 4 Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**. In accordance with Regulation 14(e) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Applicant is also required to provide: *"a non-technical summary of the information referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d)"* Accordingly, the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary APP-180], provides a non-technical summary of the description of the reasonable alternatives studied in Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES **[APP-029]**. The Planning Statement **[AS-098]** addresses points raised in the energy NPSs, including alternatives. Therefore, the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** also discusses alternatives including Annex A: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement **[AS-098]** which explains the alternative sites considered as part of site selection.