

CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC

Navenby Parish Council asked (REP2-046) that all construction traffic (not just HGVs) should avoid Navenby (i.e. along or crossing Navenby High Street). Navenby Parish Council also asked that the outline CTMP commit to more more specific enforcement measures (such as ANPR cameras at site compounds). In addition, the Parish Council asked that it be consulted about the final CTMP.

The applicant responded (REP30-025) that HGVs would not pass through the village but did not respond on either the issue of non-HGV construction traffic or consultation about the final CTMP.

In the "Springwell Solar Farm Examining Authority's Report of Findings and Conclusions and Recommendation to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero", the ExA said in paragraph 12.4.7 that:

bullet point 7 "No construction traffic is proposed to use the A607 or will pass through the settlements of Navenby Wellingore, Welbourn, Leadenham or Caythorpe."

bullet point 11 "The final CTMP will include further details on monitoring, compliance and enforcement as noted in Section 8 of the oCTMP [REP3-035]. This would include enhanced HGV identification, tracking, use of CCTV at site accesses, GPS tracking, spot checking, review of tachographs, etc, as well as details of sanctions and a reporting process."

There has been recognition of community concerns about traffic in the case of Springwell. The community does not feel there has been sufficient recognition of concerns in relation to Fosse Green. Navenby Parish Council was seeking assurance that in relation to Fosse Green, construction traffic (not just HGVs) would not pass through Navenby village and that there would be use of cameras at site accesses. In the light of continued community concern, will both the Applicant and Lincolnshire County Council confirm that they wish to avoid construction traffic passing through Navenby, cameras will be placed at site accesses and that the final CTMP will be the subject of consultation with Navenby Parish Council. REP4-014 is the applicant's response to four comments on traffic that I made in REP3-082 and REP3-083; I wish to express concern about several parts of the applicant's responses.

First, the applicant said the non-disclosure of the serious collision on Green Man Road was because it "occurred outside the extents of this study area, and beyond the extent of the road used by traffic travelling from the A15 to the site access". Even if not on the part of the road between the A15 and the site access, if the applicant is not accepting that non-HGV be restricted from that part of Green Man Road, the whole of the road should be in the study area.

Second, the applicant said LGVs would not be allowed on site before 9.00 but did not address my point that restriction could lead to them waiting in Navenby village until they are allowed on site.

Third, I note that the applicant now appears to have accepted that their previous position on shuttle buses is untenable (that no traffic would transit down the A15 through junction 12) and that rather than two buses from each of 6 centres (as previously indicated in the applicant's documents) the applicant now proposes "five collecting people from Lincoln (232 people) and three from other nearby centres (one from Newark, one from Grantham/ Sleaford & one from Retford/ Worksop)." This raises further doubt about whether the applicant has given rigorous consideration to this matter - for example, the route from Grantham to Sleaford to the site would pass through Sleaford which already suffers from massive traffic problems during school commute time. Other aspects of the applicant's response are unsatisfactory (e.g. no response on workers at the beginning and end of the working week saving time by driving straight to/from the compound from their weekend accommodation other than asserting it will be "adequately managed". The applicant states "This figure has not been challenged by LCC in its review of the submission and so is understood to be acceptable to LCC"; I am not clear to which figure the applicant refers but I would ask that the ExA seeks a comprehensive report, validated by LCC, on the shuttle bus proposals and whether they are a realistic way of reducing car traffic and their impact on the road network.

Fourth, I note the applicant did not acknowledge the errors I pointed out on the cumulative assessment but I am pleased the applicant now appears to have changed from their original position of no temporal overlaps. Nevertheless the applicant has still failed to demonstrate a reasonable worst case position. For example, I accept that "only one scheme/ development will be able to undertake connection works at any one time", and that may reduce traffic laying cable in the connection corridors: however, it would not prevent more general construction work (e.g. in relation to panels, batteries etc.). I remain of the view that the applicant has not adopted a reasonable worst case scenario assessment.

DECOMMISSIONING

I have been unable to find any response from the applicant to my submission in REP3-083 on decommissioning. At the time of writing, I was unaware that the applicant would be addressing the same subject in REP3A -025. Nevertheless, I would be pleased to see the applicant's response to my decommissioning comments in REP3-083 would be grateful if they could be provided.