Dean Moor
Solar Farm

Consultation Report: Appendix 6 – Summary of Responses Received to Statutory Consultation

on behalf of **FVS Dean Moor Limited**

March 2025
Prepared by: Alpaca
PINS Ref: EN010155
Document Ref: 5.2
Revision: 1

Firma Energy

ib vogt

DEAN MOOR SOLAR FARM

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDICES

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE EN010155

PREPARED ON BEHALF OF FVS DEAN MOOR LIMITED

Regulation: SECTION 37(3)(C) OF THE PLANNING ACT 2008
APFP REGULATION 5(2)(Q)
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (APPLICATIONS: PRESCRIBED FORMS AND PROCEDURE) REGULATIONS 2009

Project Ref:	**EN010155/Consultation Report Appendix 6**
Status:	Final
Issue/ Rev:	1
Date:	March 2025

List of Appendices

Appendix	Document
Appendix 6.1	Summary of the matters raised by section 42(1)(a) prescribed consultees, section 42(1)(b) local authorities, and section 42(1)(d) PILs in response to the statutory consultation, and section 47 consultees and the Applicants response

6.1. Summary of the matters raised by section 47 consultees, section 42(1)(a) prescribed consultees, section 42(1)(b) local authorities, and section 42(1)(d) PILs consultees in response to question 1-19,the statutory consultation including matters raised by section 47 consultees in email form that was not submitted as part of a feedback form, and the Applicants response

6.1.1. Summary of matters raised by section 42(1)(a) prescribed consultees, section 42(1)(b) local authorities, and section 42(1)(d) PILs consultees in response to the statutory consultation and the Applicants response

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Northern Gas Networks	Utilities	*"Northern Gas Networks has no objections to these proposals, however there may be apparatus in the area that may be at risk during construction works and should the planning application be approved, then we require the promoter of these works to contact us directly to discuss our requirements in detail. Should diversionary works be required these will be fully chargeable."*	N.	Noted. The Applicant has since confirmed with Northern Gas Networks that they have a gas main which runs under Branthwaite Road, and no other gas assets within the Site.
Northern Gas Networks	Utilities	The consultee provided a plan of its assets and privately owned networks and gas mains owned by other Gas Transporters within the Order Limits. The consultee also provided contact details for their Before You Dig Team.	N.	The Applicant is grateful for the ongoing engagement with the consultee during and following the statutory consultation period. The Applicant will engage with the consultee's engineering team if required regarding safe construction and operational working practices, and with their legal team to ensure that suitable protective measures can be agreed.The Applicant has since confirmed with Northern Gas Networks that they have a gas main which runs under Branthwaite Road, and no other gas assets within the Site.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
NATS Safeguarding Office	Ground Conditions / Utilities / Layout	The consultee operates no infrastructure within 10km of the Site, and accordingly anticipates no impact from the Proposed Development. The consultee has no comments.	N.	Noted.
National Highways/ Historic Railways Estate (on behalf of Department for Transport)	Transport & Access	*"The former railway overbridge GGN/10 located at NY 04805 24185 is part of the Historical Railways Estate, the bridge is owned by the Secretary of State for Transport. The bridge carries the C2054 over the former Gilgarran Branch Line.* *The single span was infilled in 2014, forming an embankment, the bridge had been understrength. Infilling the arch and forming an embankment removed any load capacity constraint. If you require any further information about the structure please let me know. There are no other HRE assets within or in the areas adjoining the proposed solar farm."*	N.	The Applicant has included additional detail of the former railway structure and proposed temporary traffic management in Section 7 of the Transport Statement (ES Appendix 2.5) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council and Westmorland and Furness Council - Joint Emergency Management and Resilience Team	Risk/H&S	The consultee confirmed that there is no emergency planning zone required for this Site. The consultee has no comments in relation to the proposed works.	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Land Use Planning Office for Nuclear Regulation	Nuclear consultation	The consultee confirmed that the Proposed Development is located within a nuclear site consultation zone, however, the Office for Nuclear Regulation does not comment on pre-planning applications. The ONR will consider the Proposed Development once a request for consultation on a formal planning application is received.	N.	The Applicant will continue to engage with the Land Use Planning Office for Nuclear Regulation once the application is submitted.
GTC Pipelines	Utilities	Please take this email as a confirmation that GTC has no assets within the order limits of this search area and therefore no objections to your proposals.	N.	Noted.
Lake District National Park Authority	Policy Context	The consultee set out the policy context for considering the impact of the Proposed Development on the National Park, which covers both Landscape and Heritage.	N.	The Applicant has considered the Lake District National Park (LDNP) and World Heritage Site (WHS) within both ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Views **[REF: 6.1]** and ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage **[REF: 6.1]** in line with policy requirements and relevant guidance.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - Views out of the National Park	*"We appreciate and welcome the effort made in not proposing panels on the higher land to the west of the site, having regard to the potential for viewers to perceive this as interfering with the transition from the coastal plain to the fells in the east."*	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - Views out of the National Park	*"The land provides some distant views of the Lake District Fells. However, the network of small lanes is more suited to local traffic. Those approaching the Lake District for recreation or visiting the area with the specific intention of enjoying the National Park landscape are more likely to use other routes. We consider therefore that any effect of the development on views into the Lake District would not be significant"*	N.	Noted.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - Views out of the National Park	*"There are only limited views available of the development from locations within the National Park Boundary. The ZTVI mapping that has been provided appears to show a greater area within the National Park than we have observed from our ground truthing, as being affected."*	N.	As set out in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**, ZTVs are a tool within the visual assessment process and provide an indication of visibility only. Ground truthing is always recommended to attain a true sense of visibility from certain locations.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - Views out of the National Park	*"The availability of views is strongly affected by the local topography. The highest portion of the land lies to the south side where the ridge of High Park-Branthwaite Edge obscures views from the south of the development site which lies to the north. The ridge is less effective in screening views from the fell tops identified below due to the ability of the viewer to see over the ridge. Our perception however is that views from valley level within the National Park (Mosser, Loweswater, Lamplugh, Cogra Moss) would be unaffected by the development, due to a combination of intervening screening, glimpsed views of parts of the development site and distance."*	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - Views out of the National Park	*"The particular views we have identified as being affected are:* *1. Fellbarrow (represented by viewpoint 14): The fell is included in the Wainwright Western Fells book (included in the 214 'Wainwright' summits). Fellbarrow stands between 8 and 9km west from the site…. Due to the position of Branthwaite Edge, the main portion of the site (Area C) would be less prominent from this location, the areas A and B would be more visible.* *2. Blake Fell and Burnbank Fell (represented by viewpoints 13, 13a and 13b): Blake Fell and Burnbank Fell are also included in Wainwrights Western Fells book, Blake Fell being 'the highest of the Loweswater uplands', and as such is a popular climb. …. These fells stand 7-8km south west of the site. Parts of the site are visible from the summit and the upper western flanks including the subsidiary summit of Knock Murton. From the summits views are available over the intervening ridge to a substantial portion of the site"*	N.	As set out in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**, View Locations (VL) 13 and 14 were agreed via email with the LDNP (22/09/2023), while VL 13a and 13b were taken during the Site visit to comprehensively understand the experience of PRoW users.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape – views out of the LDNP	*"In the Lake District National Park Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document, the affected land lies within Area of Distinctive character 8: Loweswater.*	N.	The Area of Distinctive Character 8: Loweswater has been assessed within the Schedule of Landscape Effects (ES Appendix 7.2) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape – View from the fells	*"Having regard to the distance of the views available towards the site from the fells, we consider that the detail of the development including individual structures would not be particularly apparent. The principal change would be that of a change of colour: from green fields to*	N.	The Schedule of Visual Effects (ES Appendix 7.3) **[REF: 6.3]** provides an assessment of scale and geographical extent of the Proposed Development in addition to the overall significance of effect

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		blocks of grey panels, and a sense of developed versus undeveloped character to the land. We consider that the assessment of this effect has to have regard to the overall size of the site and development. At 279ha, the site is an equivalent size to the town of Keswick. *6.10 At present, the 'evidences of urban development and industry' in this part of the West Cumberland plain are mostly focussed to the west, on the coast and around Workington. Lillyhall Industrial Estate extends this sense of developed character south and eastwards, and the proposed site would be almost contiguous with Lillyhall. We consider that the effect would be to stretch the sense of developed land into the rural area and towards the National Park. This sense would be more apparent from Blake and Burnbank Fells (as the view is more in a line: site, Lillyhall, Workington) than from Fellbarrow (where the effect would be seen from the side).* *6.11 The sensitivity of recreational users of the areas where views are available will be very high. The effect on visual amenity would be negative but we note that the change is not intended to be permanent (40 year lifespan and reversible). We consider that the magnitude of the effect from the identified views from the fells would be 'minor' having regard to the size of the development and the guidelines for managing landscape change."*		predicted from the identified view locations within the LDNP (VLs 12, 13, 13a, 13b, and 14).

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - WHS	*"As the guidance on 'setting' is more developed in relation to heritage assets than landscape designations, we would like to cover the effect on the …WHS… in this section.* *6.13 Since the development is located well outside the WHS, the development would only affect those attributes of outstanding universal value that are capable of crossing the boundaries….* *6.14 As we have found a minor adverse visual effect over a 40 year period, we consider that this translates into less than substantial harm to the WHS attribute of extraordinary beauty and harmony.* *6.15 When assessing the impact of development on a… [*WHS], *UNESCO provides guidance on this …. Therefore whilst we recognise minor adverse effect over the lifetime of the development, it is not permanent and can be removed and the land continue in agricultural use and restore the green appearance of this landscape."*	N.	The WHS was assessed both in landscape and visual terms within the PEIR and given that a 'no change' level of effect was returned, effects on the WHS have subsequently not been considered within the ES. Visual effects from the WHS have however been considered within the ES assessment of VLs 13, 13a, 13b and 14, within ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Views **[REF: 6.1]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - Mitigation	*"6.16 Mitigation of the effect would depend on the success or otherwise of any planting to break up the massing of the panels. Planting within the site would be the best way to achieve this effect, but we appreciate that any planting that would be taller than the panels would have the effect of reducing their effectiveness through shading. It is still considered that even low level planting might have an ameliorating effect."*	N.	The need to mitigate views on the Lake District National Park and World Heritage Site and the Lake District National Park Authority's response was a key consideration with the Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]** which has been developed to provide green infrastructure benefits in addition to breaking up the perceived massing of the Proposed Development. The majority of planting within the Site will be low-level hedgerow planting (approx. 1.5 - 2m height) with occasional hedgerow trees in targeted sections.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape - Mitigation	*"6.17 The battery storage facility (BESS) is shown as a collection of white cabins. Using a darker colour for these would be more visually recessive in the landscape."*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape	*"The sensitivity of recreational users of the areas where views are available will be very high. The magnitude of the effect would be minor, because although the size of the development is large, it is sited some considerable distance from the National Park boundary, and further still from viewpoints where the application site might be apparent."*	N.	Noted.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape	*"We would suggest that a high sensitivity combined with a minor magnitude would give a slight or minor*	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		harm, especially as the development would have a limited lifespan and should be reversible."		
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape	*"This effect amounts to 'less than substantial harm' to the World Heritage Site."*	N.	Noted.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape	*"We are aware that the proposed development would bring benefits to be considered and weighed against impacts identified. The importance of the appropriate generation of renewable energy is recognised in national and local plan policy (Lake District National Park Local Plan (2020-2035) Policy 20)."*	N.	Noted.
Lake District National Park Authority	Landscape	*"We would expect that we would not wish to object to a submission made on the basis of the details submitted to date. Rather we would offer our opinion on the nature and extent of the effect on the National Park and World Heritage Site as advice for the decision maker to weigh when coming to their decision"*	N.	Noted.
Northumberland County Council - Planning Officer	General	*"I would confirm that Development Management have No Objection to the above consultation."*	N.	Noted.
Northumberland County Council - Planning Officer	Landscape/Visual Impact	*"Given the distance from Northumberland and intervening landscape features we offer no comment to this consultation. If there is something specific you would like us to comment on please let us know."*	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
The Mining Remediation Authority (formerly the Coal Authority)	Ground Conditions - Coal	*"Thank you for your notification of the 8th March 2024 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above.* *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.* *Our records indicate that within the area of the proposed solar farm there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; 25 mine entries, shallow coal working, coal outcrops and areas of surface coal extraction. These features pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety."*	N.	Details relating to coal mining, including mine entries are discussed with the Coal Mine Hazard Assessment (CMHA) (ES Appendix 10.2**) [REF: 6.3].**
The Mining Remediation Authority (formerly the Coal Authority)	Ground Conditions - Coal	*"We note that a Desk-Based Coal Mining Hazard Assessment report, dated August 2023 and prepared by Stantec UK Limited supports the proposal. This report acknowledges the extensive coal mining legacy affecting the site. It advises that intrusive investigations will be required in order fully characterise this legacy, particularly where more sensitive elements of the development are proposed."*	N.	The ground investigation recommended in the CMHA (ES Appendix 10.2) **[REF: 6.3]** will be undertaken post consent and the information used to inform detailed design.
The Mining Remediation Authority (formerly the Coal Authority)	Ground Conditions - Coal	*"Where mine entries are present we would expect the layout of the solar panels to be designed to avoid directly locating panels, or structures, over these features or within their zones of influence. The location of the mine entries should be*	N.	The ground investigations recommended in the CMHA (ES Appendix 10.2) **[REF: 6.3]** will be undertaken post-consent with the results of the investigations used

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		identified, either through intrusive works, or position review from source data, and the area of potential instability fenced to prevent unauthorised access into these areas in order to protect public safety. The Coal Authority has adopted a policy where, as a general precautionary principle, the building over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry should wherever possible be avoided, even once treated. Our adopted policy on the matter can be found at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-on-or-within-the-influencing-distance-of-mineentries"		to refine the design (i.e. embedded mitigation by design). In relation to mine entries, no permanent building associated with Work Nos 1, 2, or 3, or temporary buildings associated with Work No. 4 will be located within 50m from any former mine entries.' The ability for the Proposed Development to place other infrastructure in these areas is subject to further investigation, and if necessary, remediation prior to construction. This buffer has been informed by this response and further discussions with the Mining Remediation Authority.
The Mining Remediation Authority (formerly the Coal Authority)	Ground Conditions - Mine Gas	*"It should be noted that wherever coal resources or coal mine features exist at shallow depth or at the surface, there is the potential for mine gases to exist. These risks should always be considered as part of the decision making process. The Planning & Development Team at the Coal Authority, in its role of statutory consultee in the planning process, only comments on gas issues if our data indicates that gas emissions have been recorded on the site. However, the absence of such a comment should not be interpreted to imply that there are no gas risks present. Whether or not specific emissions have been noted by the Coal Authority, the decision maker should seek its own technical*	N.	Mine gases emanating from historical workings beneath the site are identified as a potential hazard in the Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (ES Appendix 10.1) **[REF: 6.3]** and are also discussed in the CMHA (ES Appendix 10.2) **[REF: 6.3]**. As per the above, the ground investigations recommended in the CMHA will be undertaken post-consent (secured by DCO Requirement) with the results of

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		advice on the gas hazards that may exist, and appropriate measures to be implemented, from technically competent personnel."		the investigations used to refine the design (i.e. embedded mitigation by design) including a coal mining gas risk assessment following the guidance provided in CL:AIRE, 2021 and measures to be provided within the final CEMP.
The Mining Remediation Authority (formerly the Coal Authority)	Ground Conditions - Mine Gas	*"The Desk-Based Coal Mining Hazard Assessment report, and any additional information gathered in respect of the risks posed by coal mining features, should be provided with any future submissions to the decision making body in respect of this project."*	N.	The CMHA is provided as ES Appendix 10.2 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Historic England	Heritage	*"Para. 3.1.6. The 2022 guidance quoted makes no specific reference to grade II, II* listed building or scheduled monuments as is suggested. I think that this quote originates in the document published by ICOMOS in 2011 (Appendix 3A: Example Guide for Assessing Value of Heritage Assets). However, I disagree with the interpretation as the table in Appendix 3A states that 'Nationally designated structures with standing remains' are of high value. The 2022 guidance was published by UNESCO, ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS. If attributed to a single organisation, this should be UNESCO."*	N.	These comments have been discussed in a meeting with Historic England. The Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (ES Appendix 6.1) **[REF: 6.3]** has been updated according to Historic England's comments.
Historic England	Heritage	*"Para. 2.1.20. Geophysical surveys cannot on their own cannot conclude that the archaeological potential of a site is low. There are numerous examples of sites where geophysical surveys with negative results have been undertaken that have subsequently been proven to be archaeologically rich during subsequent intrusive investigations. I*	N.	As above.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		have great faith in geophysical survey but results always have to be tested in order to draw firm conclusions."		
Historic England	Heritage	*"3.1.40. Papcastle was the site of two successive Roman forts and associated civilian settlement, known during the Roman period as Derventio, rather than a walled Roman city with associated fort."*	N.	As above
Historic England	Heritage	*"4.1.8 to 4.1.19. Whilst it is possible to make a judgement, based on available evidence, on the likelihood of currently unknown archaeological remains to be present (i.e. archaeological potential), It is not possible to predict the significance of any such remains, and they could range from low to very high"*	N.	As above
Historic England	Heritage	*"5.1.8. I do not agree that the solar panels will better reveal the significance of heritage assets – if this point is to be made, it needs explain how this will occur"*	N.	As above
Historic England	Heritage	*"Table 5. The section relating to the English Lake District World Heritage Site (ELDWHS) quotes the outdated 2011 guidance. The current 2022 guidance does not contain such a matrix."*	N.	As above

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Historic England	Heritage – Geophysical Survey Report	*"Geophysical Survey Report* *Again, I do not agree with the statement 'Overall, it is determined that the survey results provide a reliable indication of the archaeological potential of the geophysical survey area (GSA). The archaeological potential is consequently assessed as low.'"*	N.	These comments have been discussed in a meeting with Historic England. The Geophysical Survey Report (ES Appendix 6.2) **[REF: 6.3]** has been updated according to Historic England's comments.
Historic England	Heritage – Geophysical Survey Report	*"No intrusive investigations have been undertaken to test the interpretation of identified anomalies, or to identify any archaeological deposits / remains that would not be represented as anomalies (i.e. that are 'geophysically invisible')"*	N.	As above
Historic England	Heritage	*"PEIR Chapter 6 'Cultural Heritage'* *Para. 6.3.12. DMRB 2007 has been superseded and should not be used. If DMRB is to be used (and I would question its relevance for a solar scheme), it should be the current version of DMRB. The robustness of assessments based on superseded guidance can be open to question"*	N.	These comments have been discussed in a meeting with Historic England. ES Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage **[REF: 6.1]** has been updated according to Historic England's comments.
Historic England	Heritage	*"Para. 6.3.26. LDNP WHS should be English Lake District WHS"*	N.	As above
Historic England	Heritage	*"Para 6.3.27. HEDBA states that the site visit was undertaken in March 2023."*	N.	As above
Historic England	Heritage	*"Para 6.3.32 Current 2022 UNESCO guidance should be quoted, not superseded 2011 ICOMOS guidance. Please note that neither the 2011 or the 2022 guidance make any specific reference to grade I, II* or II listed buildings, or scheduled monuments. In any case, the table in Appendix 3A of the 2011 guidance states that 'Nationally-*	N.	As above

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		designated structures with standing remains' are of high value (i.e. all listed buildings are of high value)"		
Historic England	Heritage	*"Table 6.1. It would be useful to have consistency of terminology to avoid confusion – either archaeological 'remains', 'resources', or 'receptors'."*	N.	As above
National Highways	Transport Statement / outline Construction Traffic Management Plan	The consultee raised the following matters: ▪ Further information on the assessment of accident causation factors on the Strategic Road Network ('SRN'). ▪ Concerns regarding congestion at peak periods on SRN and at Lillyhall Roundabout. ▪ Concerns regarding evidence base for assessment of Lillyhall Roundabout. ▪ Further information on the location of laybys on SRN. ▪ Clarification on staff estimates, staff minibus services and internal parking arrangements. ▪ Concerns regarding pedestrian access feasibility.	N.	The Applicant undertook further engagement with National Highways and Lostrigg Solar DCO in response to the points raised by National Highways. As part of this response, a more detailed cumulative assessment of Lillyhall Roundabout was undertaken, as well as a more detailed description of accident information at the roundabout. Please see the Transport Statement (ES Appendix 2.5) **[REF: 6.3]**. Further information has been provided within the Transport Statement (ES Appendix 2.5) **[REF: 6.3]** regarding staff estimates, minibus services and parking arrangements / estimates in order to address the points

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				raised by NH. Additional information was also provided on pedestrian access arrangements, which is set out within the Framework Construction Workforce Travel Plan (see Section 7 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) (ES Appendix 5.2) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Electricity Northwest	Infrastructure / Assets	The consultee has provided a list of their overhead and underground assets which could be impacted by the Proposed Development, along with details of where their apparatus are covered by easements.	N.	The Applicant is grateful for the ongoing engagement with the consultee during and following the statutory consultation period. ES Chapter 3 **[REF: 6.1]** described the buffers and exclusion areas which have been established to form the Works Nos. including around the 11kV and 132kV OHL and pylons. ENW's guidance has been applied in selecting these areas. The Applicant will engage with the consultee's engineering team regarding safe construction and operational working practices, and with their legal team to ensure that suitable protective measures can be agreed. Discussions are ongoing.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council	Cultural Heritage	The consultee welcomes that detailed surveys of the site and surroundings have been undertaken to establish the impacts on the setting of nearby heritage assets, including a Geophysical Survey of the southern part of the Site to look for indicators of potential archaeology. The consultee indicated that they accept the approach to embedded mitigation for the setting of the designated heritage receptors, and notes that additional mitigation measures during the construction and decommissioning phases would be implemented through a CEMP and a DEMP. *"It is accepted that with mitigation measures implemented, the potential effects on the unknown below ground archaeological remains would be Moderate Beneficial (which is significant) during the construction phase.* *Residual Moderate Adverse effects (which are significant) are expected for the Large Irregular Stone Circle and a Round Cairn on Dean Moor and Wythemoor Sough and Adjoining Barn and Stable during the operational and maintenance phase due to the potential impacts on their setting. There would be no other significant effects to heritage receptors."*	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual	*“A …[Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment] LVIA… is included within the PEIR. This has been informed by Site visits and photography from representative viewpoints agreed with the Council and the* [LDNP].”	N.	This remains the case for the ES assessment in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Likely Significant Effects	*"The assessment of landscape and visual considers effects of the Proposed Development on:* *• Landscape character within which the Site is located;* *• Landscape elements (the ‘fabric’ or features, which contribute to character); and* *• Views available to people and their visual amenity, from publicly accessible viewpoints"*	N.	This remains the case for the ES assessment. These conclusions are detailed within Appendix 7.2: Schedule of Landscape Effects **[REF: 6.3]** and Appendix 7.3: Schedule of Visual Effects **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Likely Significant Effects	*"During the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development, Significant Moderate Adverse direct effects on the landscape character of the Site were assessed due to the change from open farmland to a solar farm development. "*	N.	This remains the case for the ES assessment. These conclusions are detailed within Appendix 7.2: Schedule of Landscape Effects **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Likely Significant Effects	*"You advise there would be Moderate Adverse, indirect effects to LCT 9a: Open Moorlands during the construction phase, although by the decommissioning phase, the vegetation planting would be effective in reducing this effect to not significant. The remaining landscape receptors, including the WHS and the Special Qualities of the LDNP would not experience significant effects. "*	N.	Where previous receptors assessed within the PEIR were noted as experiencing *‘No change’*, these receptors were removed from the ES assessment in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Likely Significant Effects	*Significant adverse visual effects during construction would be focussed on locations in close proximity to the Site. Visually, effects during the decommissioning period would also be similar to those experienced during construction, however the majority will be reduced in severity as a result of screening from new and enhanced planting of vegetation.*	N.	This remains the case for the ES assessment. These conclusions are detailed within ES Appendix 7.3: Schedule of Visual Effects **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Likely Significant Effects	*"During the operational and maintenance phase, there would be a direct Moderate Adverse effect to the landscape character. Properties near the Site represented by View Location ('VL') 6/6a (Dean Cross) and VL7 (Rigg House) would experience a Major Adverse (significant) visual effect, and a Moderate Adverse (significant) visual effect is anticipated to VL9 (Wythemoor House)."*	N.	This remains the case for the ES assessment. These conclusions are detailed within ES Appendix 7.2: Schedule of Landscape Effects **[REF: 6.3]** and ES Appendix 7.3: Schedule of Visual Effects **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Likely Significant Effects	*"Your assessment on the Landscape and Visual Likely Significant Effects are accepted following the review of Viewpoints provided."*	N.	Noted.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Mitigation Measures	*"Embedded mitigation measures include:* *• Retention of existing Site boundary vegetation …* *• Use of existing field entrances during delivery/ construction …* *• Careful siting of infrastructure to minimise visual intrusion, …* *• Suitable buffers between the solar farm and ancient woodland and watercourses;* *• The maximum height of the Proposed Development would be 4.5m within considered areas to minimise visual effects;* *• Provision of sheep grazing where possible …*	N.	These embedded mitigation measures have been retained and are set out in more detail in the ES Section 7.6 **[REF: 6.1]** and the Landscape Strategy Plan (Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]**. With respect to these measures, it remains the case that the majority of the Proposed Development features will be limited to a maximum height of less than 4.5m (with the majority of the

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		• *Reinforcement of existing field boundaries;* • *New native structural landscape planting to provide visual screening, development…, and linking existing habitats / landscape features where possible to provide enhanced green infrastructure and biodiversity opportunities. "*		developable areas being covered by solar arrays with a max height of 3.3m, interspersed with ancillary buildings at a max height of 3.6m. However, the Grid Connection Infrastructure of Works No 2 will have a max height of up to 9m for some elements of the external electrical equipment, with Works No 2b POC Masts adjoining the existing pylon on-Site being taller at up to 30m.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Mitigation Measures	*"Potential enhancement measures to the embedded mitigation are acceptable, to include additional scrub and woodland planting on the steeper, southern section of Thief Gill; and scrub and marginal planting including wildflower areas along watercourses to enhance habitat connection and provide Biodiversity Net Gain."*	N.	These enhancement measures are reflected within Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**, within Appendix 7.7 OLEMP **[REF: 6.3]**, Chapter 8: Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]** and Appendix 8.8: Biodiversity Net Gain Report **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Mitigation Measures	*"The updated Concept Layout includes additional buffers, areas for landscape screening and siting of panels to account for natural screening through topography. It is noted that mitigation would reduce the potential visual impact on neighbouring residents."*	N.	The Landscape Strategy Plan has been developed to reduce visual impacts from nearby residential receptors, road users and recreational users of local PRoW where practicable.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Residual Effects	*"During construction, the proposed planting would not be established, and the CEMP is not anticipated to result in changes to the likely significant effects. Therefore, the significant Moderate Adverse effects are predicted to the landscape character of the Site and the LCT 9a: Open Moorlands, would remain. "*	N.	Assessment has been undertaken with regards to Figure 3.4: Parameter Plan **[REF: 6.2]** and is set out in Sections 7.5 and 7.7 of ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Residual Effects	*"It is noted there would be Major to Substantial Adverse effects (significant) effects to visual receptors located nearby to the construction, including VL6/6a (Dean Cross), VL7 (Rigg House), VL9 (Wythemoor House), VL3c (Dean Cross Road) and VL10 (PRoW 230010), however by operation Year 15, once the landscape planting has matured, there would be a Negligible to Moderate Beneficial long-term effect for landscape features."*	N.	Assessment has been undertaken with regards to Figure 3.4: Parameter Plan **[REF: 6.2]** and is set out in Sections 7.5 and 7.7 of ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**. The assessment of visual effects over time has also been informed through the use of visualisations which are presented within Appendix 7.6: Visualisations **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Residual Effects	*"During the operational and maintenance phase, a significant Major Adverse effect is assessed for the visual receptors at VL7 (Rigg House) and a significant Moderate Adverse effect for the visual receptor VL6/6a (Dean Cross)."*	N.	Assessment has been undertaken with regards to Figure 3.4: Parameter Plan **[REF: 6.2]** and is set out in Sections 7.5 and 7.7 of ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council	Landscape & Visual Residual Effects	*"Residual effects during the decommissioning phase would be similar to those experienced during the construction phase, with Moderate Adverse effects anticipated to the landscape character. Visually, significant Moderate-Major Adverse effects would remain for the closest receptors"*	N.	Assessment has been undertaken with regards to Figure 3.4: Parameter Plan **[REF: 6.2]** and is set out in Sections 7.5 and 7.7 of ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**.
Cumberland Council	Glint and Glare	*"Glint and glare occurs when sunlight is reflected off the surface of solar panels, rather than being absorbed. This can be due to the angle of the sun, the angle of the panel, or the type of panel. This is a disadvantage, in terms of the solar panel's purpose, which is to absorb sunlight and convert it into electrical energy. It is noted that the anti-reflective surfacing on solar panels has improved to reduce this issue in general with modern panels. Glint and glare should be carefully considered within the detailed design on receptors as set out above."*	N.	Glint and Glare is assessed in ES Appendix 7.9: Glint & Glare Assessment **[REF:6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Biodiversity	The consultee summarised the Biodiversity baseline, likely significant effects, mitigation measures and residual effects. The consultee raised no comments on these matters.	N.	Noted. A detailed response has been received from the Ecologist at Cumberland Council, which is included below.
Cumberland Council	Climate Change	The consultee summarised the Climate Change baseline, likely significant effects, mitigation measures and residual effects. The consultee raised no comments on these matters.	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council Local Lead Flood Authoirty (LLFA)	Flood Risk	*"The LLFA has had preliminary discussions with the applicant and it is noted and agreed that the site is in Flood Zone 1 and is at low or very low risk from surface water flooding. However, there are several ordinary watercourses running through the site with some small areas of localised fluvial flood risk and some small ponds."*	N.	The Applicant has discussed the LLFA's response since the statutory consultation, as evidenced in Appendix C of the FRA (ES Appendix 2.4) **[REF: 6.3]**. Section 5 of the FRA (ES Appendix 2.4) **[REF: 6.3]** provides an overview of flood risk from all sources which confirms that the majority of the Site is at low flood risk.
Cumberland Council (LLFA)	Flood Risk	*"The LLFA do not consider that the permanent development will cause any material change in flood risk but there could be impacts from the construction / decommissioning phase and potential for water quality issues depending on how the land use and management of the fields and the planting / landscape management of planting under and around the panels."*	N.	The topic of flood risk has been addressed via a comprehensive assessment that has been reinforced by subsequent engagement with the LLFA (see above). Water quality impacts at the construction stage are addressed through suitable mitigation as set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) (Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**. A detailed CEMP will be produced to be substantially in accordance with the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**. The Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) in Section 8 of the FRA **[REF: 6.3]** sets out the operational phase drainage proposals which avoids impact on

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				watercourses by promoting measures such as buffers from watercourses, implementing filter materials where needed for improving water quality, and excluding the use of deep infiltration measures.
Cumberland Council (LLFA)	Construction Environmental Management Plan	*"It is noted that a fully detailed CEMP will, be developed and secured by way of condition. This approach is acceptable to the LLFA. However, it is reassuring that certain measures have already been proposed in the OCEMP. These will be need to be further explored and additional detail provided in the CEMP to include: Low ground pressure machines; a detailed Soil Resource Management Plan; a delivery sequence to avoid repeat tracking over the same area; measures to minimise leaching and control runoff/leaching to controlled water; monitoring weather conditions and pausing works or evacuating the site as deemed Necessary; silt and pollution management. These measures (and others) will be need to be further explored and additional detail provided in the CEMP."*	N.	An OCEMP provided at ES Appendix 5.1 **[REF: 6.3]** which sets out appropriate mitigation measures for avoiding water quality impacts, monitoring weather conditions, emergency procedures, and silt and pollution management. An OSMP is provided at ES Appendix 5.3 **[REF: 6.3]** which outlines measures to manage the soil resource on-site, including an expectation for the use of low ground pressure models.
Cumberland Council (LLFA)	Land-use and Landscape Management	*"It is proposed to include the recommended planting and management strategies of the land under and surrounding the panels from the Cook and McCuen paper. This will mean that the majority of the site will be a fully vegetated species-rich grassland which will act as a level-spreader / energy dissipater which will reduce erosive sheet flow."*	N.	This approach is set out within section 8.2 of the ODS (ES Appendix 2.4) **[REF: 6.3]**. Well-managed solar farms provide full year-round vegetated ground cover, which is more effective at slowing runoff and providing a source for infiltration than land

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				subjected to intensive arable or livestock grazing uses.
Cumberland Council (LLFA)	Access Track Drainage / Flood Risk	*"New tracks will be fully permeable and the accesses onto the highway will be permeable asphalt. The LHA is satisfied with this approach in principle. Further details should be provided in the planning documents."*	N.	Access tracks will be of fully permeable construction such that there will be no increase in runoff from these areas. The drainage strategy is provided in Section 8.8 of the FRA (ES Appendix 2.4) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council (LLFA)	Ancillary buildings, inverter units and BESS drainage	*"Due to the minimal surface area involved, the remote, rural location the potential for SUDS and infiltration as proposed is acceptable to the LLFA in principle. Further design details of the SUDS strategy and confirmation of ground conditions to facilitate infiltration will be required.* *<u>Information Necessary to Support a Planning Application</u>* *The following documents would be required to support a planning application:-* *• Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water (SUDS) Drainage Strategy* *• Revised / finalised CEMP incorporating the CSWMP"*	N.	Noted. Further information about the proposed SUDS is included within the Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) in ES Appendix 2.4 **[REF: 6.3]**. The final strategy for adoption of SuDS and the SuDS maintenance plan, including a maintenance schedule and details of easements and outfalls for the drainage system, will be produced at the detailed design phase, and provided as a DCO Requirement. The final detailed Drainage Strategy will sit alongside the final LEMP and OMP to provide holistic Site environmental management, including management to prevent flood risks to/from the Site, to prevent adverse impacts on water

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				quality, and to protect the watercourses as habitats. The OCEMP (Appendix 5.2) **[REF: 6.3]** has been informed by the FRA and ODS (Appendix 2.4) **[REF: 6.3].**
Cumberland Council	Socio-Economics	The consultee summarised the Socio-economics baseline, likely significant effects, mitigation measures and residual effects. They raised no comments on the likely significant effects, mitigation measures and residual effects. The consultee considered the Local Study Area to be appropriate to assess effects on expenditure, residential communities, tourism and recreational uses. They raised no comments on the Wider Study Area. The consultee noted the environmental and community benefits of the Proposed Development.	N.	Noted.
Cumberland Council	Health Impact Assessment (HIA)	*"Officers consider there could be benefits in providing a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of the socio-economic considerations."*	N.	Whilst there is the potential for the Proposed Development to result in human health impacts during its construction, operation, and decommissioning phases, appropriate measures have been embedded into the design of the Proposed Development and into the various management plans that will be secured via the DCO,

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				which will seek to avoid and/or reduce potential significant effects relating to human health. Further, within the Council's guidance, there is no set requirement to conduct a HIA for solar development, nor a methodology to do so. It is considered that any potential effects relating to human health will be controlled via embedded and additional mitigation and do not pose a significant risk to human health. As such, a separate human health chapter or a Health Impact Assessment has not been included within the ES. Potential effects linked to human health arising from the Proposed Developpent and how they have been considered through specialist assessment are outlined in Section 2.9 of ES Chapter 2 **[REF: 6.1]**.
Cumberland Council	Ground Conditions	The consultee summarised the Ground Conditions baseline, likely significant effects, mitigation measures and residual effects. The consultee raised no comments on these matters.	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council	Comments from Cumberland Environmental Health	*"Looking at the Non-technical summary, in relation to ground conditions they are proposing a ground investigation report. This is agreed, however I would also recommend that gas monitoring is undertaken as part of this report.* *Consideration should be given to any buildings proposed on the site (to house inverters of transformers) as well as any excavation of the site that may affect the current ground gas conditions. In addition, I would be keen to see the location of each of the transformers and inverters to ensure that they are not close to any residential receptors."*	N.	As set out in OCEMP Section 11 **[REF: 6.3]**, it is anticipated that the ground investigation would comprise a series of mechanically excavated trial pits, trial trenches and deeper boreholes to allow the installation of groundwater and ground gas monitoring installations. A post-investigation ground gas monitoring period may also be undertaken, depending upon the ground conditions encountered.
Cumberland Council	Comments from Cumberland Environmental Health	*"A construction management plan should also be included as part of the application ensuring that this covers noise and dust management."*	N.	An Outline Construction Management Plan (OCEMP) is provided at Appendix 5.1 **[REF: 6.3]**, which covers noise (within Section 7 Noise and Vibration) and dust (within Section 8 Control of Air Pollution).
Cumberland Council	Noise	*"A Noise Impact Assessment ('NIA') informs the PEIR. This considers the impact from construction and operational noise. During operation, the main sources of noise would be from the Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning ('HVAC') systems associated with the BESS and solar inverters. The Concept Layout which is assessed within the PEIR has been informed by the NIA work which identified the areas within the Site where noise emitting elements can be sited to avoid any observable adverse effects from noise.* *It is noted that a full NIA will be provided to*	N.	Noted. The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		supplement the ES, which will consider a refined iteration of the layout. This NIA will advocate for a DCO Requirement for further evidence or assessment to demonstrate that the final design and procured technology will also meet the standard of having no observable adverse effects."		
Cumberland Council	Battery Safety	*"There is a framework for agreeing an outline Battery Safety Management Plan ('oBSMP') with the Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service ('CFRS'). The applicant has engaged with CFRS in relation to their requirements for the oBSMP, and the standards which must be met to minimise risk to the public and to the CFRS. The general approach to design and layout of the BESS facility has accounted for in Government guidance and industry best practice and will be refined through ongoing engagement with CFRS. You advise BESS facility designs and battery safety systems have improved after a few high profile incidents with facilities which were installed early in the development of the technology. The BESS will be sited within Area C, likely near the POC infrastructure that connects to the grid. A contained central location is primarily to avoid noise impacts, but has the added benefit of being well located for safe access and avoids proximity to surrounding properties in the event of an*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		emergency incident. *Effects on local amenity during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases will be major adverse. This is in relation to visual amenity as assessed in PEIR Chapter 7 – Landscape and Visual."*		
Cumberland Council	Access Traffic and Transportation	*"A Transport Statement ('TS') considers the traffic, access and transportation issues which would need to be addressed within the construction and operational phases of the Project. This is complemented by an outline CTMP which sets out minimum commitments for managing transport and access in construction to avoid undue impacts on local road network users. The Project is considered to be well placed to take advantage of the surrounding transport network, including good connections to A595 and wider trunk road network."*	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council (Local Highways Authority)	LHA Response	The consultee raised the following points in their consultation response: ▪ Recognition of construction period and Decommissioning Plan. ▪ Inclusion of requirement within the Construction Environmental Management Plan ('CEMP') to form a community liaison group to operate during construction period. ▪ Consideration of the use of internal haul roads and minimising routeing on public highway. ▪ Ensuring sufficient mitigation measures provided within CTMP and CWTP, including travel plan coordinator.	N.	The Applicant notes the comments from the LHA.
Cumberland Council (Local Highways Authority)	LHA Response - Information Necessary to Support a Planning Application	*"The following documents would be required to support a planning application:-* *• Finalised Transport Statement and CW Travel Plan* *• Finalised CTMP"*	N.	A Transport Statement is provided at ES Appendix 2.5 **[REF: 6.3]**. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) is provided at ES Appendix 5.2 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council	Public Right of Way	*"Officers note you advise that a topic of particular local interest was the public access routes which cross the northern half of the Site but have not been formalised as Public Rights of Way ('PRoW'). It is noted that the design of the Proposed Development accounts for the possibility that these routes may become PRoW and be added to the Definitive Map in the future.*	N.	Noted. Two permissive paths are proposed in the Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figure 7.6.1-7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		It is welcomed that the Proposed Development will also establish at least two new 'permissive paths' to provide a recreational route in the north and new linkage between existing Gilgarran Road and Dean Cross Road and the Proposed Development will not preclude the use of any existing informal routes that may continue to be used or which may be formally adopted as PRoW by the Council."		
Cumberland Council	Statement of Community Consultation	*"No further comments are provided on the community consultation process at this stage."*	N.	Noted.
Cumberland Council	Summary	The consultee summarised the mitigation measures, likely significant effects and mitigation measures as set out in ES Chapter 12. They raise no comments on these matters.	N.	Noted.
Cumberland Council	Summary	*"You advise the Proposed Development will assist in tackling the climate emergency and help the UK Government in meeting its target to reach net zero by 2050 and ambition to reach at least 70 gigawatts of installed solar capacity by 2035."*	N.	Noted.
Cumberland Council	Other Consents Required from the Council	*"Please note, that in addition to requiring planning consent this application proposal would also require the necessary permits, S278 agreements and any other similar permits for carrying out works on the public highway. The details can be confirmed in our response to further consultations when the scheme has been confirmed."*	N.	The Applicant will obtain additional agreements and permits as necessary. A Consents and Licenses Position Statement is included within the application which identifies which consents and agreements may be required. The Local Highways Authority have since advised that

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				a Section 278 agreement is not envisaged.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Paragraph 3.8.1 states that a buffer of 250m was chosen. Best practice guidelines state that a buffer of 500m should be used with 250m being acceptable for large linear schemes. Robust justification should be given as to why the smaller buffer zone was adopted."*	N.	The Applicant has provided justification within ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Paragraph 4.2.28 - Adequate exclusion zones must be in place from the outset of design to ensure that direct impacts to notable habitats such as ancient woodland and hedgerows, and other habitats of ecological value such as plantation woodland, and ponds are avoided."*	N.	This is set out in the OCEMP and OLEMP for both construction and operation which are provided at ES Appendix 5.1 and ES Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]**, respectively.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Natural England should be consulted on approach to bat activity surveys. Whilst the Site has low level of bat interest and the grassland habitat will be retained due to solar panels installation, it should be understood how bats use the Site currently, and therefore how enhancements can be designed to improve bat interest at the Site. Therefore, bat activity surveys should be undertaken throughout the Site according to BCT guidelines to establish how bats are using the Site. I note that bat activity surveys were undertaken in 2023 and written up in the bat report."*	N.	Bat activity surveys have been undertaken in line with guidance to understand assemblage and included in ES Appendix 8.3 **[REF: 6.3]**. Enhancements have been designed to support the local bat population and are included in the OLEMP which is provided at ES Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Paragraph 4.6.8 - surveys to be included should be for breeding birds, over wintering birds and autumn and spring passage surveys."*	N.	This is reported on in ES Appendices 8.5 and 8.6 **[REF: 6.3]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Whilst reptile surveys may not be recommended, future design should incorporate hibernacula to improve the Site for reptiles and encourage them to the area."*	N.	It is proposed that tree cuttings from management are included as habitat piles across the Site. This is detailed in the OLEMP which is provided at ES Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"If development has not commenced within 24 months of the eDNA surveys being undertaken for GCN, then these surveys must be repeated."*	N.	Pre-construction surveys will be undertaken as per best practice, further information is available from the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"I'd expect to see walked transects for the activity surveys to understand how bats are using the Site, not just how many, but willing to be presented with robust justification as to why only static detectors were put out.* *If development has not commenced within 24 months of the bat surveys being undertaken, then these surveys must be repeated."*	N.	Justification for the approach taken during bat surveys has been included in this chapter and in ES Appendix 8.3 **[REF: 6.3]**. Pre-construction surveys will be undertaken as per best practice and where necessary.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"If development has not commenced within 24 months of the otter and water vole surveys being undertaken, then these surveys must be repeated."*	N.	Pre-construction surveys will be undertaken as per best practice and where necessary.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Post-development enhancement should incorporate habitat enhancement for these 66 bird species that were recorded as part of the surveys, but most notably, for those BoCC red listed species."*	N.	Enhancements which benefit birds include hedgerow management; improved grassland management and the enhancement of Dean Moor County Wildlife Site (CWS). Habitat enhancements are included in the OLEMP which is

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				provided at ES Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Paragraph 8.5.15 – in this case siltation fencing must be considered further as in Section 8.6"*	N.	Silt fencing will be considered where appropriate. This is detailed in the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Paragraph 8.5.19 – this contradicts Paragraph 5.1.3 in the non-technical summary which states that working hours in the week will be 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday. Please confirm that these timings therefore are during the summertime."*	N.	Paragraph 8.5.24 of ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity **[REF: 6.3]** reflects the impacts of daylength through season and potential impacts to bats.
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Section 3.4 for Biodiversity and ID 3.4.2 – this suggests that a HRA is not required. I would argue that a full HRA is undertaken for a development of this size before impacts to internationally designated sites can be scoped out.* *ID 3.4.6 on dormice and 3.4.7 on ancient woodland – I agree that more information is needed before likely significant effects to these receptors can be scoped out."*	N.	The sHRA is included in ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3].** Dormouse have been scoped out of this assessment and a rationale provided (Other Species) in Section 8.4 of ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**).
Cumberland Council – Ecologist	Attachment - Ecology Consultation Response	*"Paragraph 5.4.5 – this should include measures to protect small mammals from construction activities."*	N.	An ECoW will be appointed during construction to advise on species protection. This requirement is set out in the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Environment Agency	Key Issues to be addressed: Flood Risk	*"We require confirmation that the Lostrigg Beck river does not pose a significant risk to this site. The current EA models in this area only offer a*	N.	Consultee comments have been addressed through a comprehensive assessment,

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		higher level overview only. *There could likely be fluvial flood risk at the confluence between the ordinary watercourse and the Lostrigg Beck and we would like confidence that the risk has been investigated. It may be a very minor risk and a meeting with the LLFA to address our concerns could be sufficient."*		including engagement with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), who confirmed during a meeting in June 2024 that they are satisfied with the use of the generally more conservative data available from existing open data sources for assessing the risk of flooding from all sources (see Appendix D for meeting minutes). Section 5 of the FRA **[REF: 6.3]** provides an overview of flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, pluvial, groundwater, reservoirs, and artificial sources, confirming that the majority of the Site is at low flood risk, with isolated areas subject to low to high risk due to local surface water flow routes and natural depressions. Details on managing surface water runoff from the Site can be found in Section 7 of the FRA.
Environment Agency	Key Issues to be addressed: Biodiversity	*"Further clarification will be required regarding the approach to the Biodiversity Net Gain and how it will be delivered. We advise that opportunities in Local Nature Recovery Strategies and any mitigation measures listed for the affected waterbodies under Water Framework Directive are considered. Please note some additional surveys are required."*	N.	Approach to delivering BNG for the Proposed Development is set out in a detailed BNG Report included as Appendix 8.8 **[REF: 6.3]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan	*"Greater clarity on the OCEMP is required to ensure it is clear how mitigation will be delivered and oversight and prioritization requirements are clearly understood."*	N.	Section 2 of the OCEMP (Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]** provides a summary of the hierarchy of oversight and responsibilities. Further detail is provided within each section of how mitigation will be delivered and monitored.
Environment Agency	Environmental Permits and Consents	*"Any requests to disapply any permits or consents should be sent to us in writing as soon as possible to allow us sufficient time to consider them (minimum 6 months). Depending on the outcome this will have implications on the content of the Development Consent Order (DCO). Environmental permits will be required to carry out any water discharge activities with a potential for contamination (for example from areas of exposed soil during construction). Some of the information required within a permit application may be more easily obtained during further survey work required to produce the Environmental Statement. We recommend the applicant engages with our permitting pre-application advice service to ensure that quality permit applications are submitted within suitable timeframes to prevent the risk of delays to the project."*	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Requirements and Protective Provisions	*"Sufficient time is required to ensure we can appropriately respond to discharge of requirements and protective provision consultations. Please ensure in your Development Consent Order a minimum of 21 days is stipulated as a response time for the discharge of requirements and a minimum of 61 days for protective provisions. Environmental permits will be required to carry out any water discharge activities. This includes discharges of trade effluent, sewage effluent, or surface water run-off with the potential for contamination (for example from areas of exposed soil during construction).* *Some of the information required within a permit application may be more easily obtained during further survey work required to produce the Environmental Statement. We recommend the applicant engages with our permitting pre-application advice service to ensure that quality permit applications are submitted within suitable timeframes to prevent the risk of delays to the project."*	N.	Noted.
Environment Agency	Flood Risk Assessment	*"Issue: The flood risk on site is not fully understood. Environment Agency flood maps/ models do not go into sufficient detail to assess third-party developments. The* *developer should not assume that the maps/models is suitable for assessing the flood risk associated with the proposed development. The Environment Agency's Flood Map suggests that the proposed development is in Flood Zone 1. However, where a catchment is less than 3km^2*	N.	Consultee comments have been addressed through a comprehensive assessment, including engagement with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), who confirmed during a meeting in June 2024 that they are satisfied with the use of the generally more conservative data available from existing open data

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		the fluvial flood risk is not represented by the Flood Map for Planning. This level of information is required to assess the impacts of this development. The most southerly section of the Lostrigg Beck (and the inflowing ordinary watercourses) do not have their fluvial flood risk represented by the Flood Map for Planning, because the catchment size is less than 3km^2. *This leads to an evidence gap in the representation of fluvial flood risk (i.e., the 1 in 100-year flood event). Further to this, the developer has not adequately considered* *the future fluvial flood risk to the site and elsewhere, i.e., they should consider the 1 in 100-year plus climate change flood event. Further investigation by the Environment Agency using Lidar and available modelling data reveals that the Order Limits are not at fluvial flood risk from the main river Lostrigg Beck, but there could be some fluvial flood risk associated with the ordinary watercourses which join the Lostrigg Beck at head of main river just upstream of the road crossing at 304940, 523640. This area is low lying, and a number of watercourses converge at the road before joining the Lostrigg Beck. The developer has not adequately considered the current and future fluvial flood risk from these watercourses.* *Impact: The proposal may increase flood risk to the site and elsewhere within the lifetime of the development.* *The assessment of fluvial flood risk may affect*		sources for assessing the risk of flooding from all sources (see Appendix D of the FRA (ES Appendx 2.4) **[REF: 6.3]** for meeting minutes). Section 5 of the FRA (ES Appendix 2.4) provides an overview of flood risk from all sources, including fluvial, pluvial, groundwater, reservoirs, and artificial sources, confirming that the majority of the Site is at low flood risk, with isolated areas subject to low to high risk due to local surface water flow routes and natural depressions. Details on managing surface water runoff from the Site can be found in Section 7 of ES Appendix 2.4.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		other considerations within the proposal such as flood storage compensation and the finished floor levels of sensitive components such as the Battery Energy Storage System and substation. Note that the development must remain operational during the design flood. *Assess the fluvial flood risk with consideration of the 1 in 100-year plus climate change flood event particularly for the ordinary watercourses just upstream of head of main river of the Lostrigg Beck at 304940, 523640.* *Solution: We would recommend that the developer arranges a meeting with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority to discuss this matter and agree a proportionate way forward.* *If the existing model/ maps continues to be used. Please ensure it:* *- Represents current risk.* *- Uses the latest available datasets.* *- Complies with current modelling standards.* *- Is at a scale suitable for the assessment being undertaken.* *- Captures the detail required for a site-specific assessment.* *- Makes use of current climate change allowances.* *Please be aware that:* *- It is the developer's responsibility to assess the suitability of* *a model for the project.* *- The developer should provide evidence of any modelling*		

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		checks and subsequent updates and document these in the FRA model reporting"		
Environment Agency	CEMP mitigation mechanisms	*"Issue: The current oCEMP does not provide an adequate mechanism through which appropriate mitigation can be secured.* *Impact: The current oCEMP does not provide us with the desired confidence that water quality impacts will be mitigated. If the oCEMP does not make it clear how mitigation will be ensured, there is a risk that significant water quality impacts (resulting in significant impacts on the environment) could be experienced during construction of the scheme.* *Solution: The oCEMP should provide a clear framework for the development of the detailed CEMP. The language used within the oCEMP should be less ambiguous (see Section 5.4.5 below) and, if exact details are not currently available, should confirm where further plans or procedures will be developed and included within the detailed CEMP (see Section 5.7.5 below)."*	N.	Section 2 of the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]** sets out the hierarchy of roles, responsibility, and oversight of the construction phase. Measures to control pollution and contamination prevention are set out within Section 10 of the OCEMP. Impacts on surface water and flood risk management, including minimising impacts on water quality are set out within Section 12 of the ES OCEMP.
Environment Agency	CEMP compliance	*"Issue: No detail is provided within this section, or the oCEMP in general, on how compliance with the detailed CEMP will be assured.* *Impact: Lack of oversight between a project team and their Principal Contractor, or between a*	N.	As above.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		Principal Contractor and their subcontractors, is a common cause of environmental incidents and harm at construction sites. The level of detail provided does not give us confidence that the detailed CEMP will be complied with. *Solution: We recommend utilising available guidance on the creation of the oCEMP and detailed CEMP, such as IEMA Practitioner Volume 12 (2008). Plans and procedures could be ensured in the oCEMP, and produced in the detailed CEMP, which would cover monitoring, reporting, and reviewing environmental compliance. It would also be useful to have details on how corrective action would be taken if environmental risks or harm are identified."*		
Environment Agency	CEMP legislation	*"Issue: This section introduces the list of legislation in Appendix A which construction staff will be required to adhere to. The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (EPR 2016) are not included in this list.* *Impact: EPR 2016 creates a legal requirement to hold an environmental permit to carry out a water discharge activity. It is one of the key pieces of legislation which will protect against impacts to water quality during construction. If construction staff are not adhering to this legislation, there could be an increased risk of pollutions and/or illegal discharges.*	N.	The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 have been considered and are listed in Appendix A of the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		Solution: EPR 2016 should be included in Appendix A. The oCEMP should make it clear that no water discharge activity will take place unless an appropriate environmental permit is held. The detailed CEMP should include measures which, if followed, will ensure compliance with any environmental permits held."		
Environment Agency	CEMP mitigation	*"Issue: This section outlines mitigation measures which may be put in place during construction of the solar arrays, including the creation of a pollution prevention and control plan. The wording used in this section makes it unclear whether these measures will be implemented, or whether they are suggestions which may or may not be incorporated into the detailed CEMP.* *Impact: Ambiguous wording of this nature risks a lack of implementation by the principal contractor. Stating mitigation "can be put in place", instead of "will be put in place", does not provide us with confidence that water quality will be adequately protected by the detailed CEMP.* *Solution: The oCEMP should make it clear which mitigation measures will be included within the detailed CEMP, and therefore implemented onsite."*	N.	Section 10 of the OCEMP (Doc ref) **[REF: 6.3]** outlines measuers to preventand manage pollution and contamination and the minimum methodologies and controls that will be carried forwards into the CEMP.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	CEMP monitoring	*"Issue: We support the monitoring that is proposed within this section. However, it is unclear how this will be secured within the CEMP.* *Impact: Without an appropriate mechanism to secure this monitoring, there is a risk that it will not be carried out routinely or effectively by the principal contractor.* *Solution: The oCEMP should secure the production of a monitoring strategy within the detailed CEMP. To provide confidence in the efficacy of this monitoring strategy, the oCEMP could also include a brief outline of what should be included within the finalised version."*	N.	The CEMP, produced to be substantially in accordance with the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**, will secure the delivery of the monitoring strategy. Section 12.4 of the OCEMP outlines how the final CEMP will be updated.
Environment Agency	BESS Drainage Strategy	*"Issue: The Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy confirms that the SuDS strategy for the BESS will be considered more fully in the Environmental Statement. Until the drainage strategy for the BESS is understood, we are unable to assess the mitigation proposed to prevent firewater entering surface waters or groundwater.* *Impact: There is a risk that we could have low confidence in the ability to retain firewater at the BESS, depending on the design of the drainage design for that area. If the firewater is not contained it can cause significant pollution and detrimental impacts on the environment and protected species.* *Solution: It should be clear within either the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy or the Framework*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development so a BESS Drainage Strategy is no longer required.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		Battery Safety Management Plan how retention of firewater will be achieved. If this level of detail is not possible within the Environmental Statement, then there should be a clear method of securing this mitigation within the detailed versions of these documents."		
Environment Agency	Sheep grazing	*Issue: Damage to establishment of vegetated buffer strips, from sheep grazing.* *Impact: Sheep may preferentially graze the sown species-rich grass mix, thereby preventing the establishment of vegetated buffer strips around the watercourse on site.* *Solution: Consider erecting exclusion fencing at terrestrial-edge of buffer strips along main watercourses (Thief Gill/Lostrigg Beck).*	N.	An Outline Grazing Management Plan (OGMP) is included in the OLEMP (ES Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]**. which will be secured by a DCO Requirement. Exclusion fencing at the edges of buffer strips to be considered within the next phase of design and as part of the GMP.
Environment Agency	Watercourse buffers	*Issue: There is no apparent reference to the width of the proposed buffer strips for the watercourses.* *Impact: Buffer strips need to be an appropriate width, to provide a suitable buffer and to effectively protect the watercourse from sediments, enable bank stabilisation through vegetation establishment and allow space for commuting by mammals.* *Solution: Buffer strips should measure a minimum of 10m from the top of the riverbank to the development for all watercourses on the Site unless existing physical constraints prevent this."*	N..	There will be no solar PV infrastructure within 8m of the bank top of any watercourse. The 8m buffer is secured through the Works Plans within the DCO, and is shown on ES Figure 3.4: Parameter Plan **[REF: 6.2]**, and ES Figure 3.5: Exclusion Areas **[REF: 6.2]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	CWS	*£Impact: The solar development area partly encroaches into the Dean Moor Farm County Wildlife Site (CWS).* *Issue: Whilst the solar arrays are to be located outside of purple moor-grass communities, there is a lack of ambition with regard to enhancing the CWS, considering the scale of the works.* *Solution: More ambitious habitat creation plan. The CWS could be further enhanced by expanding the purple moor-grass community on the Site, thereby refining the condition of the CWS, providing an enhancement under the BNG Metric, and adhering to the Allerdale Borough Council Local Plan to "enhance conditions for priority habitats… identified in the Cumbria and UK Biodiversity Action Plan"*	N.	Enhancements to Dean Moor CWS have been a fundamental part of the environmental design of the Proposed Development from the outset. These measures have been discussed with the Cumbria Wildlife Trust (CWT) on 2 May 2024. The proposed enhancements will be agreed with CWT prior to construction commencing. Management of enhancements and set out the OLEMP (ES Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Environment Agency	Habitats following decommissioning	*"Impact: Loss of habitat enhancements and mitigation following decommissioning phase and reinstatement of land to agricultural use* *Issue: Examples could include a loss of vegetated buffers around watercourses or decline of enhanced hedgerows if grazing pressure was increased* *Solution: Ongoing maintenance should be agreed through signed landowner agreements, to commit the next landowner to maintain such biodiversity enhancements for the future.*"	N.	The purpose of the ES is to assess the effects incurred during the lifecycle of the Proposed Development. The future land use beyond decommissioning is unknown and does not fall with the scope of the ES.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Mammal gates	*"Issue: Proposal to install mammal gates along temporary fences/barriers during construction phase. However, there is no information on the specification or the target species (such as badger or otter) which these gates are to be designed for.* *Impact: Without knowing what these gates are designed for then we cannot advise on their effectiveness/ provide appropriate advice/ guidance. Without appropriate design protected species may be harmed.* *Solution: Provide further information and specification of mammal gates and the intended target species, to enable consultees to comment effectively*."	N.	Gaps will be provided around the perimeter fence to allow species such as badger, hare, fox and hedgehog entry. The detailed design of ecological mitigation, including gaps around the perimeter, will be secured by a DCO Requirement.
Environment Agency	European Eels / Brown Trout	*"Issue: The Thief Gill/Lostrigg Beck is designated a European eel migratory route and brown trout have been recorded on the Site. Neither species have been surveyed for, therefore the applicant should assume these species are present on the Site* *Impact: Despite the CEMP and SUDS in place, there is still the potential for sedimentation to negatively affect both species [eels and brown trout] during the construction and decommissioning periods.* *Solution: Habitat enhancements and mitigation measures should be proposed specifically for eels and brown trout."*	N.	This comment relates to both Biodiversity and Hydrology. With regards to Biodiversity, construction phase mitigation will be provided to safeguard these species, including pollution prevention and control measures to negate risks to water quality; no solar PV infrastructure within 8m of bank tops. During operation these watercourses will be enhanced in line with Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, and ES Appendix 8.8 – Biodiversity Net Gain Report

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				[REF: 6.3]. In terms of Hydrology, the SUDS strategy outlined in Section 7 of the FRA (ES Appendix 2.4) **[REF: 6.3]** and OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]** outline that the proposed SUDS win not use deep excavation for water disposal. Section 7.10 of the FRA outlines how the SUDS strategy has incorporate measures aimed at enhancing water quality.
Environment Agency	Enhancements to Thief Gill / Lostrigg Beck	*"Impact: We support the proposal to plant vegetation within the Thief Gill/Lostrigg Beck (Section 4.2.6) due to the current sparsity of vegetation (Section 2.3.5), but enhancements could go further.* *Issue: Lack of ambition with regards to enhancing watercourse habitats on the Site [Thief Gill and Lostrigg Beck], considering the scale of the works.* *Solution: Enhancements to include bankside vegetation planting and improving in stream habitat, which would support issues identified within the River Marron Catchment Action Plan*."	N.	Enhancement and management are set out in the OLEMP (ES Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]** and the Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]** sets out the location of these enhancements along Thief Gill.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Wetland creation	*"Issue: Recommendation in PEA regarding the creation of new wetland habitats, yet there appears to be no proposal to create wetlands in proposed enhancements.* *Impact: Lack of ambition with regards to enhancing wetland habitats on the Site, considering the scale of the works.* *Solution: Incorporate wetland creation into enhancement plan. Create wetland habitat in wet flush areas, for example by blocking up artificial drainage channels. This would also contribute to an improvement in water quality and provide natural flood management, therefore contributing to issues identified within the River Marron Catchment Action Plan."*	N.	Pond habitats will be improved as part of the Proposed Development's Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figure 7.6.1-7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]**. Detail of the management of these habitats is set out in the OLEMP in ES Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Environment Agency	Rhodedendron	*"Impact: Target note of rhododendron present in woodland located to the north-east, however there is no reference to methods on how to control this species to prevent spread.* *Issue: It is an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to allow the spread of a Schedule 9 species.* *Solution: Include measures to control and prevent the spread of rhododendron in a Biosecurity Plan.*"	N.	The plant is not located on Site. However, a Biosecurity Management Plan is included in the OLEMP (ES Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]** to ensure this plant does not spread and become established on Site.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Water Vole and Otter Repeat Surveys	*"Issue: Water vole and Otter surveys were completed in 2023, and construction is projected to begin in 2026. There appears to be no mention of repeat surveys prior to construction. CIEEM's Advice Note 'On the lifespan of ecological reports & surveys' states that species survey data may be out of date around 12-18 months following a survey.* *Impact: Otters are highly transitory species, therefore an otter could construct a holt prior to construction in 2026. This may result damage or destruction of holts or disturbance during construction, which are offences under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).* *Solution: An otter and water vole survey should be repeated pre-construction. Similarly, a badger survey should also be repeated."*	N.	Pre-construction surveys for protected species, including otter and water vole, but also badger, will be carried out prior to construction. Further information on pre-construction surveys is set out in the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Environment Agency	Groundwater and Contaminated Land	*"Issue: A foundation works risk assessment (FWRA) has not been mentioned within the outline CEMP.* *Impact: If the ground investigation identifies contamination at the site in the vicinity of where piled foundations will be used it is possible that they could create pathways for the vertical migration of contamination.* *Solution: Include a recommendation to complete a FWRA if contamination is identified.*"	N.	The Phase 1 GCA (ES Appendix 10.1) **[REF: 6.3]** recommends that ground investigations are undertaken at the Site to confirm the ground conditions present in areas of potential geoenvironmental hazards. These investigations will be undertaken post-consent where necessary. If / where contamination is identified, a FWRA will be prepared and will be submitted for

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				approval, with any additional mitigation that results to be included as part of the final CEMP. The OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]** includes a requirement for an FWRA should contamination be encountered. Furthermore, the OCEMP will inform the CEMP, which will outline pollution prevention measures to limit impacts on groundwater quality during construction phases. These measures align with the EA's groundwater protection objectives, which focus on preventing contamination, managing potential pollution sources effectively, and protecting groundwater resources through site-specific risk management practices. Evidence of engagement is available in the meeting minutes appended in Appendix D.
Environment Agency	Permits and Consents: Dewatering	*"Dewatering was previously exempt from requiring an abstraction licence. Since 01 January 2018, most cases of new planned dewatering operations above 20 cubic meters a day will require a water abstraction licence from us, prior to the*	N.	It is not anticipated that any activities will require dewatering.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		commencement of dewatering activities at the site. If dewatering is required, it will require an abstraction licence if it doesn't meet the criteria for exemption in The Water Abstraction and Impounding (Exemptions) Regulations 2017 Section 5: Small scale dewatering in the course of building or engineering works. It may also require a discharge permit if it falls outside of our regulatory position statement for dewatering discharges. Consumptive abstraction from Groundwater may not be available, more details can be found in the Abstraction Licensing Strategy for the catchment. If the dewatering activity can be demonstrated to be discharged to the same source of supply without intervening use (i.e. non-consumptive), this will increase the likelihood of a licence being granted. Examples of (consumptive) intervening uses include: dust suppression; mineral washing; washing down machinery and potable supply. Any dewatering activities on-site could have an impact upon local wells, water supplies and/or nearby watercourses and environmental interests. More information is available on gov.uk: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/water-management-apply-for-a-water-abstraction-orimpoundment-licence#apply-for-a-licence-for-a-previously-exempt-abstraction. If dewatering and discharging into surface water is required during development, the following Regulatory Position Statement will apply: 'Temporary dewatering from excavations to surface water.'		

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/temporary-dewatering-fromexcavations-to-surface-water *Further information on how to assess the hydrogeological impacts of dewatering abstractions can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hydrogeological-impact-appraisal-fordewatering-abstractions"*		
Environment Agency	Environmental Regulation and Permitting Requirements	The DCO proposed development may need the following regulatory and / or Environmental Permit requirements. This is not an exhaustive list; because ultimately Environmental Permit requirements will vary depending on the final DCO proposed development location and method of construction / decommissioning. At your earliest convenience, we strongly encourage entering into our enhanced permit preapplication service: Get advice before you apply for an environmental permit - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)	N.	The relevant permit requirements have been discussed with the Environment Agency during the pre-application stage. The potential need for specific consents is set out within Appendix A of the Consents and Agreements Position Statement.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Environment Agency	Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP)	The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be obtained for any activities which will take place: • on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal) • on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal) • on or within 16 metres of a sea defence • involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert • in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the riverbank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission. It should not be assumed that a permit will automatically be forthcoming, and we advise consultation with the Environment Agency at the earliest opportunity. For further guidance please visit https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activitiesenvironmental-permits or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm) or by emailing enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk. If you have any questions, please contact me on the details below	N.	As above.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Electricity North West Ltd	CAD/GIS Data for identified features	The consultee provided GIS excerpts showing the locations of poles on the overhead line.	N.	The Applicant is grateful for the ongoing engagement with the consultee during and following the statutory consultation period. ES Chapter 3 – Site and Propsoed Development Description **[REF: 6.1]** describes the buffers and exclusion areas which have been established to form the Works Nos. including around the 11kV and 132kV OHL and pylons. ENW's guidance has been applied in selecting these buffers / exclusion areas. The Applicant will engage with the consultee's engineering team regarding safe construction and operational working practices, and with their legal team to ensure that suitable protective measures can be agreed. Discussions are ongoing.
Ministry of Defence	N/A	The consultee confirmed that the Proposed Development falls outside of MOD safeguarded areas and does not affect other defence interests. The MOD, therefore, has no objection to the development proposed.	N.	Noted.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
National Grid	Utilities	The consultee confirms that NGET has no existing apparatus within or in close proximity to the proposed site boundary but would like to be kept informed as the proposal progresses.	N.	Noted.
Cumbria Wildlife Trust	CWS	*"The development of the Site could lead to potential negative impacts to the designation features of Dean Moor CWS particularly within the construction and decommissioning phases. Therefore, we would like to see any high value habits within the Dean Moor CWS clearly marked and appropriate stand-off distances applied during development and decommissioning activities."*	N.	Measures to protect habitats within the CWS and supervise staff working close to these habitats during construction are set out within Section 5.5 of the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**. The Decommissioning Management Plan will include measures equivalent to those provided by the CEMP, as set out within the FDMP (ES Appendix 5.4) **[REF: 6.3]**. Only a small part of the CWS will be impacted by construction. However, the CWS will be enhanced as part of the Proposed Development as it falls under Work No.1 and Work No. 6. Grassland enhancements, the inclusion of buffer strips, and the relaxation of grazing across the Site will also be applicable to

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				Dean Moor CWS. The Landscape Strategy Plan (Figures 7.6.1 to 7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]** shows these enhancements with further details on management provided in the OLEMP (Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumbria Wildlife Trust	CWS	*"There are also a number of water courses within the CWS and wider development site and we'd also like to see the implementation of best practice near watercourses during these phases to mitigate pollution by chemicals and sediments particularly from high rainfall on exposed soils*."	N	Construction and operation of the Proposed Development will comply with best practice and mitigation set out in the OCEMP (Appendix 5.1) and OLEMP (Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Cumbria Wildlife Trust	CWS	*"Whilst we understand that the final layout of the development is still to be determined and that the area designated as CWS might not be used to site solar arrays we would prefer that the CWS was not utilised for this purpose. If parts of the CWS have to be used then we would ask that the areas utilised are restricted to those currently grazed as intensive pasture and that any high value habits (e.g. purple moor grass & rush pasture) are significantly buffered from the remainder of the development."*	N.	Part of the CWS being used for the Proposed Development is currently intensively grazed. As outlined in the Landscape Strategy Plan (Figure 7.6.1-7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]** the area of the CWS under Work No. 1 will be enhanced through suitable grassland management to promote species diversity and sward heterogeneity. Grazing will be relaxed to promote biodiversity in the CWS, including under solar arrays.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumbria Wildlife Trust	CWS	*"As with the positioning of solar arrays we would also not like to see the removal of vegetation from high value habits to facilitate construction such as cabling, perimeter fencing, and the installation of access tracks. These too should be restricted to those areas currently grazed as intensive pasture."*	N.	Construction will comply with best practice and as set out within the OCEMP (Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**. Where habitats are affected, impacts will be minimised, and appropriate mitigation implemented where necessary.
Cumbria Wildlife Trust	CWS	*"We would like to see a review of land management practices for the CWS including the existing grazing regime to deliver biodiversity benefits such as potentially through the restoration of species-rich grassland. Cumbria Wildlife Trust has many years of restoring and managing species-rich grasslands and if desirable we would be happy to input into the development of any restoration/grazing management plans for the CWS and wider development site."*	N.	Dean Moor CWS will be subject to a GMP to restore and enhance biodiversity. The GMP is included in the OLEMP which is provided at Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]**. Suitable grassland management to promote species diversity and sward heterogeneity will enhance the CWS. The restoration approach will be discussed and agreed with CWT.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumbria Wildlife Trust	CWS	*"In addition to the above we'd like to see the following measures put in place across development site:* *• Retention of existing areas of woodland and scrub and creation of new woodland and scrub wherever possible;* *• Enhancement to existing hedgerows and establishing new hedgerows;* *• Planting (reeds/ enhanced tree and shrub planting) within the Thief Gill Gully;* *• Avoiding sheep and solar arrays (and construction within the watercourses and gullies).* *• Appropriate grazing across site to increase species-richness of existing grassland.* *• Establishing and improving existing ponds.* *• Increasing connectivity of habitats across the development site and with those outside Dean Moor of to create wildlife corridors."*	N.	Mitigation measures are set out within the OLEMP and include details on habitat protection, restoration and enhancement (including terrestrial, riparian and aquatic areas); grazing management; planting regimes, their management and monitoring; and maintained connectivity for species dispersal across the Site through sympathetic placement of mammal gaps around the Site's perimeter. The OLEMP is provided at Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]** which includes an outline Grazing Management Plan to manage grazing across the CWS. These measures were informed by engagement with the Cumbria Wildlife Trust.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Peat	*"It is our understanding that peat soils are present within the development site. The extent and depth of these should be determined before development plans are finalised so they can remain consolidated and avoid their disturbance during the construction and decommissioning phases. Whilst these peatland soils no longer form part of functioning healthy peatland habitat their disturbance will increase their decomposition and result in increased soil loss due to increased exposure to air and run-off. Solar arrays, cabling, perimeter fencing, and the installation of access tracks should also avoid peat soils."*	N.	A Peat Survey Report is included in Appendix 10.3 **[REF: 6.3]**. No Solar PV infrastructure or buildings within Work No. 1 and Work No. 2 are permitted within 10m from the location where peat's presence has been confirmed in the Peat Survey Report (ES Appendix 10.3) [**REF: 6.3**].
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Natural England advise that a shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment will be needed to assess potential impacts on the River Derwent and Bassenthwaite Lake Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Potential disturbance impacts on otters should also be assessed in the HRA based on further survey work."*	N.	An sHRA is included as ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]** and assesses the potential for likely significant impacts to the SAC qualifying features.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"The shadow HRA may also need to assess impacts on Solway Firth SPA birds dependent on the survey results."*	N.	The sHRA included as ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]** assesses impacts to the SPA and its qualifying species.
Natural England	Hen Harrier Surveys	*"Natural England can review the results to date and provide advice as to whether further hen harrier surveys are required."*	N.	Noted. Hen harrier surveys have since been shared with Natural England.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"As above – impacts on otter will need to be assessed in a shadow HRA as they are a*	N.	Otters are considered as part of the sHRA included as ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		designated feature of the River Derwent & Bassenthwaite Lake SAC."		
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Natural England can advise further once we have sight of the results."*	N.	Noted. A draft of the sHRA has since been shared with Natural England and their feedback addressed within the ES.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Pollution to designated sites during operation and maintenance should be scoped into the HRA."*	N.	The sHRA included as ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]** assesses pollution to designated sites.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Further assessment will be required in the shadow HRA on construction phase."*	N.	sHRA included as ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Construction phase impacts on otters will need to be assessed in the shadow HRA. "*	N.	Otters are included as part of the sHRA (ES Appendix 8.7) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Further assessment will also be required in the shadow HRA for any SPA qualifying species recorded on site."*	N.	The sHRA assesses SPA qualifying species (ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Drainage	*"Nature-based solutions should be used to manage and improve drainage on the Site such as natural drainage channels, ponds, and hedgerow and shrub planting. Spraying off vegetation to prevent it growing between the panels increases the risks of erosion, carbon emissions, run-off and pollution to watercourses. Associated infrastructure such as concrete surfaces and tracks should be designed to avoid direct run-off into watercourses and other sensitive areas."*	N.	Nature-based solutions, such as grazing, will be used to manage the Site where practical. On-sSite drainage will be included and make use of landscape-led natural drainage measures alongside targeted SuDS for ancillary buildings. The approach to manage the proposed and existing vegetation within the Site is

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				included in the OLEMP provided at ES Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3].** The drainage strategy for associated infrastructure is included within the and the FRA in ES Appendix 2.4 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Further assessment will be required in the shadow HRA"* [with respect to otter].	N.	Otters are considered as part of the sHRA (ES Appendix 8.7) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Loss of breeding bird habitat should be avoided, mitigated, or lastly compensated regardless of the habitat being common in the surrounding landscape."*	N.	Habitat protection by the inclusion of buffers along hedgerows and watercourses; the protection of trees; enhancement of grassland (including Dean Moor CWS); woodland; ponds and watercourses which includes riparian planting will benefit several breeding bird species. The relaxation of grazing across the Site will promote a diverse sward for ground nesters and reduce disturbance to those in boundary habitats like hedgerows. Green corridors are presented in Work No. 6 which indicate how habitat connectivity has been considered in the design of the Proposed Development in order to link adjacent habitats used by breeding birds.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"Further assessment will be required in the shadow HRA for any SPA qualifying species recorded on Site.* *Further assessment will be required in the shadow HRA."*	N.	sHRA included as ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]**. This provides both the screening Assessment of European Sites within the ZoI and the details of qualifying features and conservation objectives of both SACs and the SPA. Those sites where LSE have been identified will then be considered at the Appropriate Assessment Stage and mitigation presented to offset impacts. The sHRA (ES Appendix 8.7) **[REF: 6.3]** considers the Proposed development alone and in-combination with other projects or plans.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"See Table 2 below regarding soil excavation."*	N.	Acknowledged.
Natural England	Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	*"These mitigation measures should be included in the shadow HRA"*	N.	sHRA included as ES Appendix 8.7 **[REF: 6.3]**. The relevant mitigation measures have been carried over into the sHRA.
Natural England	Landscape Ecological Management Plan	*"The LEMP should help establish clear objectives and responsibilities for management, maintenance and monitoring of the habitats created."*	N.	Management of enhancements, and their objectives, prescriptions and targets are set out the OLEMP (ES Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3].**

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Effect of decommissioning on Soil Health	*"Whilst arable reversion to grassland has been shown to benefit soil organic matter (SOM), this benefit will only extend to the duration of the reversion, i.e. during the operational phase and restricted to those areas of land currently under cultivation. However, there could be a disbenefit to the soil resource due to unknowns as a result of the solar development infrastructure. It is currently unclear as to what impact the solar panels may have on the soil properties such as carbon storage, structure and biodiversity. For example, as a result of changes in shading; temperature changes; preferential flow pathways; micro-climate; and vegetation growth caused by the panels. Therefore, it is unknown what the overall impact of a temporary Solar development will have on soil health.* *A key mitigation measure to minimise the potential detrimental impact of construction on the soil resource is that the grass sward is fully established (i.e. no bare ground), prior to the installation of the panels and associated infrastructure. This should be specified in the Framework Soil Management Plan."*	N.	Noted. The OSMP includes a commitment to maintaining the existing grass sward (i.e. no bare ground) over Work No.1 area before trafficking over by construction plant and delivery vehicles, with supplementary pre-seeding to occur in areas of bare earth depending on conditions as assessed in pre-commencement.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Natural England	Detailed Soil Survey	*"In the absence of detailed survey for the northern part of the site it is not possible to provide an accurate baseline and demonstrate the likely potential impacts. So, whilst this may make the mitigation precautionary, it means that the project is unable to show how it avoids impacts to BMV soils nor the design of potential mitigation to safeguard the soil resources."*	N.	The Agricultural Land Classification Report (ES Appendix 2.8) **[REF: 6.3]** sets out the quality of the soil across the site including the northern portion.
Natural England	Construction impacts on wet soil	*"Soils should only be handled when in a dry and friable condition, soil handling should normally be avoided during October to March inclusive, irrespective of soil moisture conditions, because it will generally not be possible to establish green cover over winter to help dry out soils and protect them from erosion. A field suitable method for assessing whether soils are in a dry and friable condition based on plastic limits set out in Part One (Supplementary Note 4 –Table 4.2 provided below in Annex 1) of the Institute of Quarrying's Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Working, and this approach together with the associated rainfall protocols should be adopted."*	N.	The Outline Soil Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.3) **[REF: 6.3]** sets out the soil handling procedure in Section 3.5 and Appendix A.
Natural England	Reinstating soil to baseline ALC Grade	*"Where soils are being reinstated, we welcome the commitment to reinstate soils to their pre-development agricultural use. Where topsoil is proposed to be stripped, typically for construction compounds; access tracks; battery storage and laying cabling, the soil handling methodology (movement, storage & replacement) and soil protection proposals are reviewed to ensure that*	N.	Noted. The soil handling methodology and soil protection proposals are set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.3) **[REF: 6.3]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		appropriate mitigation is in place to allow for the restoration of the land to the baseline ALC Grade."		
Natural England	Peat areas	*"Natural England have provided previous comments on the requirements for survey of Area C.* *According to the September 1990 MAFF survey data (ref 2FCS 50Y9) there are pockets of Deep Peat in this area. A detailed survey will identify the presence of Deep Peat or Peaty soils. The PPG for the Natural Environment advises the use of the Defra Code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites to help guide the use and protection of soils on development sites; this includes peat soils as well as other soil types.* *Given the location of the proposed development on mapped areas of peat, it would be expected for the potential impact of the development on peat to be included in the assessment, including the potential impact on the carbon within the peat as per the IEMA (2022) Guidelines.* *Excavating peat may alter the hydrological status of the site and surrounding area. The full consideration of the peat budget (i.e. if there is any surplus peat) needs to be factored in, including its handling, storage and restoration. A Peat Management Plan would be key at the application phase, alongside any compensation restoration. But ultimately, the peat is likely to be an inappropriate platform on which to develop.* *Consideration needs to be given to the potential*	N.	Noted. A Peat Survey Report is included in ES Appendix 10.3 **[REF: 6.3]**. No Solar PV infrastructure or buildings within Work No. 1 and Work No. 2 are permitted within 10m from the location where peat's presence has been confirmed in the Peat Survey Report (Appendix 10.3).

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		damage to the soil (including peat) resource resulting in a downgrading of the ALC grade, which could be caused by inappropriate soil handling for temporary works."		
Natural England	Peat	*"Handling of peat should be avoided. As above a soil survey would identify if there was any peat within the site boundary."*	N.	Noted. A Peat Survey Report is included in ES Appendix 10.3 **[REF: 6.3]**. The procedures regarding peat are set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.3) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Stripping topsoils	*"Where topsoil is proposed to be stripped, typically for construction compounds; access tracks and laying cabling, the soil handling methodology (movement, storage & replacement) and soil protection proposals are reviewed to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to allow for the restoration of the land to the baseline ALC Grade."*	N.	Noted. The soil handling methodology and soil protection proposals are set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.3) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Displacement on soil from cable routing	*"The temporary displacement of soil as a result of the underground cable installation and temporary haul and access roads/construction compounds can result in permanent land quality change and soil damage if undertaken inappropriately, therefore, Natural England support the commitment to consider these impacts in the SMP. This is required for consultees and decision makers to understand the extent (ha) and likely long-term impacts on agricultural land quality (ALC grade)."*	N.	Noted. The soil handling methodology and soil protection proposals are set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.3) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Natural England	Effects of decommissioning on soils and aftercare	*"Plans of the detailed ALC grades should be provided in the Soil Management Plan (SMP) to be prepared and submitted with the ES. The SMP should include an aftercare programme which*	N.	The ALC grades are summarised within Paragraph 1.1.5 of the Outline Soil Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.3) **[REF: 6.3]** and

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		would enable a satisfactory standard of agricultural after-use to be reached, with regards to cultivating, reseeding, draining or irrigating, applying fertiliser, or cutting and grazing the site. *The SMP should recognise the exact amount (%) of BMV land that has been identified in the ALC report.* *We note there is no assessment of the decommission process on soils (including BMV land). Natural England advise that within the ES, there is a commitment to decommissioning and an outline decommissioning plan.* *There should be more attention given to the latter stages of project lifecycles (i.e. decommissioning), ensuring that mechanisms for environmental mitigation, restoration and enhancement that are built in at the design stage are secured well into the future.* *The spatial distribution of ALC grades determined from a detailed ALC survey are necessary to inform the reinstatement criteria, which allows the area of each ALC Grade temporarily disturbed to be returned to the same quality as far as practicable to minimise potential loss."*		within the ALC Report (ES Appendix 2.8) **[REF: 6.3]**. Decommissioning is addressed in the Framework Decommissioning Management Plan (FDMP) (ES Appendix 5.4 **[REF: 6.3]**. A detailed Decommissioning Management Plan document suite will be agreed with the Council prior to the commencement of decommissioning, however, at this stage it is considered appropriate to provide a framework document which provides a degree of flexibility to adapt the requirements to suit planning, consenting requirements, and likely technological advancements. As set out in the FDMP, a Decommissioning Soil Management Plan and Site Restoration Scheme would be included as part of the Decommissioning Management Plan.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"Dean Parish Council and Distington Parish Council have been working together on a joint approach regarding the proposed community benefit package associated with the Dean Moor Solar Farm project"*	N.	The Applicant has increased the Community Benefit Package following the statutory consultation, and has engaged further with Dean and Distington Parish Councils on this in

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				December 2024. This will continue outside of the DCO process.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	General	*"The parish councils of Dean and of Distington recognise the role of solar energy described in the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) and welcome the opportunity to provide a host community for the Dean Moor Solar Farm and associated battery energy storage system."*	N.	N/A
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and visual Impact	*"The proposed development at Dean Moor will, however, be visually dramatic and have a transformational impact on the landscape between the villages of Branthwaite and Gilgarran."*	N.	The Applicant has assessed the landscape and visual impact of the Proposed Development in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual **[REF: 6.1]**.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefit Fund	*"To offset this the parish councils wish to work with FVS Dean Moor Ltd and its parent companies to develop and deliver a shared plan to make our communities' energy consumption carbon neutral by 2037. To support this we expect a proportionate Community Benefit Fund to be in place in two components, initially associated with the application, development and construction phases and secondly for the full operating and remediation phases of the development."*	N.	The Applicant has increased the Community Benefit Package following the statutory consultation, and has engaged further with Dean and Distington Parish Councils on this in December 2024. This will continue outside of the DCO process.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits / Planning	*"Projects eligible for community benefit funding should* *-be associated with a shared long term Community Development Plan for the parishes of Dean and of Distington, focused on achieving carbon neutrality;* *-be aligned with the mission of ib vogt to advance*	N.	As above.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		sustainability through economic, social and environmental well-being; and *-address the climate change agenda, community health and resilience, sustainability or enhancing biodiversity and the natural environment."*		
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefit Fund	*"The initial component of the Community Benefit Fund should:* *-deliver positive transformational benefits within the host communities;* *-deliver "flagship" projects which can be clearly attributed to the support of FVS Dean Moor Ltd."*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefit Fund	*"The second ongoing component on Community Benefit Fund should be sustainable over the life of the development and index linked. "*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits / Planning	*"Dean and Distington Parish Councils will work in partnership to develop the shared Community Development Plan, informed by community engagement and relevant policy from Cumberland County Council."*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Biodiversity Net Gain, Transport & Access	*"Recognising the importance of helping nature and communities to adjust to climate change, the parish councils also welcome the intention of FVS Dean Moor Ltd to deliver a significant biodiversity net gain and to provide footpaths to increase public access across the site. We expect corridors for nature to be created across the site linking to the significant surrounding areas of existing woodland, and that the access routes will allow the public, for the life of the development, to reach and enjoy the*	N.	Green corridors are planned throughout the Site as presented in Work No. 6 and the Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]**. Two permissive paths have been proposed across the Site to facilitate public access to the improved natural environment, as shown on the

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		locations within Dean Moor where there will be an improved natural environment."		Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5).
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Context	*"The Parish Councils of Dean and of Distington recognise the role of solar energy described in the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) and broadly welcome the opportunity to provide a host community for the Dean Moor Solar Farm and associated Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), as set out in FVS Dean Moor Ltd statutory consultation documentation published in March 2024."*	N.	N/A
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Context	*"The proposed development at Dean Moor will, however, be visually dramatic and have a transformational impact on the landscape between the villages of Branthwaite and Gilgarran. It also potentially presents a number of opportunities, challenges and concerns for residents both in the construction and operation phases, and these are stated below."*	N.	Noted.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	"*Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit Landscape Character Type (LCT) states: "Key characteristics of the Ridges sub-type include the following:* *• "Distinct ridges;* *• Extensive areas of heathland moorland;* *• Improved pasture with distinctive stone walls; and* *• Woodland and small belts of trees form prominent features*." "	N.	The Proposed Development has sought to retain or enhance the key characteristics of the Ridges LCT by securing no development on the areas of heathland moorland within the southern part of the Site, suggesting the potential to rebuild / repair existing stone walls on the Site boundaries, and providing areas of woodland and linear belts of hedgerow trees, as illustrated on

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	"*Guidelines within the character assessment discuss the development, with suggestions including:* • *"Minimise the impact of development by careful siting and design and seek environmental gains such as heather and moorland restoration*."	N.	ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]** illustrates how the Proposed Development has sought to minimise the impact by breaking up the perceived massing of panels and aims to achieve areas of rough acid moorland through a relaxed grazing regime, outlined within the OLEMP (ES Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]**.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	"*The majority of land within the Site which is covered by the LCT focuses on the escarpment and plateau to the south of the Site."*	N.	The plateau will be kept free of development, and a relaxed grazing regime will be introduced to achieve areas of rough acid moorland.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	*"The land on areas A, B and C (ref page 11 of consultation booklet) is all described as acidic grassland and as such would be an ideal candidate for heather moorland restoration. This would increase the insect populations."*	N.	Areas identified within Works Area 6 will be kept free of development, and a relaxed grazing regime will be introduced to achieve areas of rough acid moorland.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	*"In terms of the site's visual impact, we would welcome more detail on how it will be minimised for properties adjacent to or within close proximity of the site e.g. Fulton's Garage at Dean Cross. We also note that nowhere within the documentation is a visual representation given of the BESS to*	N.	The measures taken to minimise visual impacts on residents is illustrated on ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5 Landscape Strategy Plan [**REF: 6.2]** within the Chapter and

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		demonstrate its visual impact, which we believe is potentially significant."		illustrated within ES Appendix 7.6: Visualisations **[REF: 6.3]**. The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	*"Additionally, the proximity of the …LDNP… has not triggered looking at a slightly wider view within the…ZTV…. The view from higher peaks that are only circa 10 km away, such as Melbreak and Blake Fell, should also be considered. Also, we note that winter and summer view simulations have not been provided."*	N.	View locations from within the LDNP were agreed with LDNP authority and include View Locations from Blake Fell (VLs 13, 13a and 13b). Winter (Year 1) and Summer (Year 15) visualisations are provided within ES Appendix 7.6: Visualisations from Blake Fell **[REF: 6.3]**.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	*"We are also confused by the various references to "fences" within the documentation, whether it be for security, safety or to exclude wildlife such as deer. We require clarification on the location, design, and height of any proposed fencing/hedging on the site, as well proposals for landscaping."*	N.	Landscaping proposals are provided within the Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2].** Fencing types proposed include perimeter fencing which is deer fencing (Works No 3), and security fencing which is metal fencing but would only be used internally within the Site around the external electrical equipment of the Grid Connection Infrastructure (Works No 2). Information regarding fencing requirements is outlined within ES Chapter 3: Site and Proposed

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
				Development Description (Para. 3.4.24 – 3.4.25) **[REF: 6.2].**
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Landscape and Visual Impact	*"Finally on the issue of potential light pollution from the site, we note proposals within the documentation for lighting across the site but again need to see more detail on type, position, elevation etc., and would welcome further consultation."*	N.	Indicative lighting proposals are discussed within ES Chapter 3: Site and Proposed Development Description **[REF: 6.1]** which describes lighting within the Site as *"not being permanently lit during the operational phase, with lighting limited to motion activated, cowled, downlighting, affixed above or aside doors of buildings within the Site."* The Council agreed to the effects of lighting being scoped out of the ES in their Scoping consultation response (see ES Appendix 2.2 EIA Scoping Opinion **[REF: 6.3]**).
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Biodiversity / Wildlife & Ecological Mitigation	*"We recognise that there will be a short term, negative but reversable impact to the biodiversity of the site whilst it is being constructed and during decommissioning. These time periods of negative impact, and the heavily developed and cleared ground planned for BESS, should be taken into account when calculating which enhancements are going to be put into place."*	N.	No BESS is now part of the Proposed Development. Management during construction will be undertaken in accordance with the OCEMP (ES Appendix 5.1) **[REF: 6.3]**.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Biodiversity / Wildlife & Ecological Mitigation	*"The potential to develop further water features on the site should not be overlooked, as this would significantly increase the biodiversity of native plant, insect and animal species and habitat on the site further, while also providing necessary water for emergencies should the need ever arise (see comments under section 4 below)."*	N.	Existing water features, including ponds and streams, are being enhanced to promote opportunities for wildlife, enhance biodiversity and improve water quality. This is set out in the OLEMP in ES Appendix 7.7 **[REF: 6.3]**.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Biodiversity / Wildlife & Ecological Mitigation	*"The details of the holistic scheme of environmental improvements, contained within the Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) when published and later put in place and monitored during the lifetime of the project, will be scrutinised in great detail by experts and lay persons alike, due to the current controversy around setting up solar farms on agricultural land. We believe that working in partnership with the local communities Dean Moor has the potential to become an exemplar solar site. In particular, taking into account the major changes than could be achieved to benefit the current and potential wildlife and communities in the vicinity of the site."*	N.	Noted.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Biodiversity / Wildlife & Ecological Mitigation	*"Finally the documentation states that at decommissioning the land will revert to its former agricultural state. If this means returning all the habitat it to its current state, then it would seem a retrograde step to lose all the net biodiversity gains made during the life of the project. We would like more clarity on this to confirm there will be no loss of biodiversity at the time of decommissioning"*	N.	As set out within the Framework Decommissioning Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.4) **[REF: 6.3]**, the final Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP) will include a Site Restoration Scheme which will detail the condition to which the land will be restored. The DMP will reinstate the Site to its current use.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Rights of Way, Footpaths and Bridleways	*"The map below is taken fromhttp://footpathmap.co.uk/* *The map shows that currently there are no legal rights of way including public footpaths on the land. However, FVS Dean Moor Ltd have committed to increasing the access to the land, but not yet committed themselves on how this will be achieved. The above shows the current footpaths/rights of way (shown in red) in the area but does not show the permissive bridleway over Potato Pot land. At the moment there is a path from Branthwaite that terminates on the road at Branthwaite Edge (midway between areas A and B) and it would be sensible to create a footpath to connect the Potato Pot bridleway to the existing path to Gilgarran. We look forward to further consultation on this matter."*	N.	Noted. While the Applicant cannot offer paths beyond the Order Limits the local passion for better countryside accessibility has inspired the introduction of two Permissive Paths for the Site.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Rights of Way, Footpaths and Bridleways	*"The map above shows the permitted bridleways across the Potato Pot land, many tracks of which were reopened by Gilgarran villagers during lockdown and are still regularly used by horses, walkers and dog walkers in the summer months. The Gilgarran/Colingate Road is marked in red."*	N.	Noted.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Rights of Way, Footpaths and Bridleways	*"Further additions to accessibility to the area could be achieved by adding a trail through area C which could include info boards to explain the biodiversity and functionality of the different structures in the site. This has the potential to give people a greater understanding of solar power and its benefits, why solar needs to be invested in, and also to educate the younger generations from local schools in the*	Y.	Noted. A permissive path is proposed along the western boundary of Area C, as shown in the Landscape Strategy Plan (ES Figure 7.6.1 – 7.6.5) **[REF: 6.2]**. Information boards are being considered and will be discussed further with the relevant

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		benefits of green technology, and potentially encourage support for future investment in solar technology"		consultees as to what they will include. These paths are discussed within the LEMP (ES Appendix 7.7) **[REF: 6.3]**, OOMP (ES Appendix 3.1) **[REF: 6.3]** and Design Approach Document **[REF: 5.8]**.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Rights of Way, Footpaths and Bridleways	*"The Parish Councils welcome the intention of FVS Dean Moor Ltd to increase public access across the site; such access routes will allow the public, during the life of the development, to reach and enjoy the locations within Dean Moor where there will be an improved natural environment. We also welcome the comments made by FVS Dean Moor representatives during the statutory consultation, that FVS Dean Moor Ltd is open to funding legal advice on how to make existing permissive routes into adopted footpaths."*	N.	Noted.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Battery Safety and Noise	*"The consultation documentation does not clearly define the size or configuration of the BESS. It is understood from the consultation public sessions that the BESS will have a maximum power output of 100MW however this does not specify the capacity of the system and hence gives no indication of the number of battery units that will be installed within the central area of the site"*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Battery Safety and Noise	*"It is understood from the consultation documentation that the battery units themselves will be in the form of ISO Containers which will be installed on concrete pedestals. The consultation documents suggest that the concrete pedestals will be placed directly onto the earth however this is not seen to be a credible solution and it is more likely that the concrete blocks will be placed on top of 300mm of compacted but porous gravel in the same way as the solar panel conversion units. It is not clear whether such compacted gravel will cover the entire battery compound area, as is common in installations elsewhere, or will be limited to the ground area under each BESS container with grassed areas between battery units."*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Battery Safety and Noise	*"It is also not clear how connecting cables between the BESS battery units, their associated power conversion units and the customer substation will be routed."*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Battery Safety and Noise	*"The lack of detail in the consultation document therefore raises several questions which are grouped below in three sections"*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Battery Safety and Noise	*"Construction phase:* *i. How many ISO container loads will the entire BESS assembly comprise and have these been included in the estimate of the number of lorry trips per day?* *ii. Will the entire BESS ground area be covered with compacted gravel? If so, how many additional loads will this comprise, and have they been included in the estimate of lorry trips? Will the existing topsoil layer be removed and preserved for future replacement, and if so where, or will the gravel be laid on top of the current land surface?* *iii. The matrix of BESS units will require a network of interconnecting cables. Will these be entrenched in the same way as those specified for the solar arrays or routed above ground? If the cables are routed underground has the resultant disruption to the pre-existing land drainage etc been considered in the environmental assessment?"*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Fire Hazard	*"In-service phase:* *i. Fire hazard - heat. Lithium batteries are generally safe however, under certain conditions, they can catch fire. Such fires are subject to thermal runaway, can be accelerated by electrical discharge • how the BESS will be laid out to minimise the fire risk;* *• how the presence of fires, or increases in fire hazard, will be monitored by the remote monitoring system;* *• what firefighting facilities including bulk water supplies will be included in the site design and*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		whether these will be capable of initiation remotely; *• or how adequate access by fire appliances will be ensured throughout the life of the facility.* *Should a fire occur, the firefighting water will become contaminated with toxic chemicals. Will the battery compound be bunded or otherwise protected to minimise run off of polluted water into the natural watercourses and ground of the site?"*		
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Fire Hazard	*"Fire hazard - Toxic fumes. In the event of a fire the fumes are potentially toxic. The prevailing winds in the area are from the southwest which means the settlement of Branthwaite Edge and the village of Branthwaite are in the downwind sector. Has the hazard from battery fire fumes been assessed and can it be demonstrated that the risk to people outside the perimeter fence is tolerable?"*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	BESS HVAC	*"Noise. The HVAC units built into the BESS units are potentially noisy, especially when the systems are working at high power either charging or discharging. Such noise will be proportionate to the number of units installed, which is not specified in the consultation documents. In addition to visual screening of the installation consideration needs to be given to installing acoustic screens to mitigate any noise nuisance to nearby properties"*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	BESS	*"Decommissioning:* *Unlike the solar arrays the BESS will make a significant impact on the natural ground conditions of the site including: a tight knit network of cable runs (potentially in trenches): concrete and gravel foundations will be present across the BESS*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development and as such, this comment is no longer relevant.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		compound, potentially covering a substantial proportion of the ground: and land drainage will have been disrupted and potentially bunded in places. This is a considerably greater challenge if it is to be returned to the condition of the site before construction takes place and will require significant expenditure. What arrangements are being made to ensure that the resources will be retained to ensure that the promised return to the "status quo ante" will be achieved?"		
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Access Travel and Transportation	*"We await more detailed proposals on the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and welcome the opportunity to become a member of the proposed community liaison group."*	N.	Noted.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"The consultation document, together with informal discussions held with FVS Dean Moor Ltd representatives during the in-person events held in March, has indicated that the developer has listened to previous feedback and has increased the potential Community Benefits Fund, both in terms of scope and value. There has been no formal written response, however, to the joint position statement issued on behalf of both Parish Councils in March 2024 and the position of both Parish Councils remains that we expect a proportionate Community Benefit Fund to be in place in two components, initially associated with the application, development and construction phases and secondly for the full operating and remediation phases of the development."*	N.	The Applicant has increased the Community Benefit Package following the statutory consultation, and has engaged further with Dean and Distington Parish Councils on this in December 2024 (Consultation Report - Appendix 7: Further/ongoing engagement **[REF: 5.2].** This will continue outside of the DCO process.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"Projects eligible for community benefit funding should:* *• be associated with a shared long-term Community Development Plan for the parishes of Dean and of Distington, focused on achieving carbon neutrality;* *• be aligned with the mission of the developer to advance sustainability through economic, social and environmental well-being; and* *• address the climate change agenda, community health and resilience, sustainability or enhancing biodiversity and the natural environment."*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"The initial component of the Community Benefit Fund should:* *• deliver positive transformational benefits within the host communities; and,* *• deliver "flagship" projects which can be clearly attributed to the support of FVS Dean Moor Ltd."*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"The second ongoing component of the Community Benefit Fund should be sustainable over the life of the development and index linked."*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"Appendix A illustrates how we would see the Community Benefit Fund deployed across the two Parish Council areas, as well as giving some initial examples of the types of projects the fund could support."*	N.	As above.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"Dean and Distington Parish Councils will work in partnership to develop the shared Community Development Plan, informed by community engagement and relevant policy from Cumberland County Council. Given the limited resources both Parish Councils have, we welcome the informal feedback already received that FVS Dean Moor Ltd will fund the engagement of an independent third party to help both Parish Councils develop such a plan."*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits - Adoptive footpaths and seed funding	*"As stated earlier, we also welcome the comments made by your representatives during the statutory consultation, that FVS Dean Moor Ltd is open to funding other professional services, the cost of legal advice on the adoptive footpaths being an example. We would also welcome the Community Benefit Fund having the remit to support applicants with early seed funding to develop proposals for compliant projects and for any related professional services."*	N.	As above.
Dean & Distington Parish Councils	Community Benefits	*"In terms of fund administration and governance, we understand the FVS Dean Moor Ltd has had some preliminary discussions with the Cumbria Community Foundation about their "hosting" of the Community Benefit Fund. A similar arrangement funded by Potato Pot Wind Farm Ltd, is administered through the registered charity Grantscapes. We would like FVS Dean Moor Ltd to consider adopting the same arrangements as for Potato Pot, as this would avoid duplication, is already successfully established and operating, and has all the governance arrangements in place*	N.	As above.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		including the involvement of local community representatives from both parishes. It would also have the added advantage of creating a larger combined funding pot, that could support bigger and more impactful projects for the community."		
Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service	BESS Fire Safety	*"Please find attached a response from Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service regarding the planning development consent order for Dean Moor Solar Farm Land located between the villages of Gilgarran and Branthwaite in West Cumbria. Thank you once again for your early engagement with CFRS and taking into account the findings from any of our previous engagements. If you have any further questions or need assistance please feel free to contact me."*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service	BESS Fire Safety	*"Following examination of plans in connection with the above application, I have to inform you that the Fire Authority has no objections to this application. However, it should be noted that access for firefighting and water supplies must comply with Approved Document B Volume 2: Buildings other than dwellings, Requirement B5: Access and Facilities for the fire service."*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.
Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service	BESS Fire Safety - NFCC Guidance	*"It should also be noted that there is guidance provided by the National Fire Chiefs Council Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning. Which can be found Here Or other such trade recognised guidance documents. Health and safety in grid scale electrical energy storage systems"*	N.	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.
Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service	BESS Fire Safety - Sprinklers	*"Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service is committed to reducing the impact of fire on people, property and the environment. For this reason, it is recommended that the applicant should give consideration to the inclusion of a sprinkler system within the design of the premises.* *There is clear evidence that sprinklers and other*	N..	The BESS has been removed from the Proposed Development.

Organisation Name	Theme	Consultee Comment	Design change (Y/N)	Applicant Response
		forms of automatic fire suppression systems can be effective in the rapid suppression of fires and therefore play an important role in achieving a range of benefits for both individuals and the community in general. *This is because sprinklers can significantly help to:* *• Improve the time available to escape from a fire* *• Reduce death and injury from fire* *• Reduce the risks to fire fighters who we ask to fight the fires* *• Protect property* *• Reduce the effects of arson* *• Reduce the environmental impact of fire* *These benefits may far outweigh the installation costs of new sprinkler systems.* *For more information on sprinklers, visit the British Automatic Fire Sprinkler Association at www.bafsa.org.uk* *If you would like to discuss this or any other matter of fire safety, please contact me at the above details."*		

6.1.2 Summary of the matters raised by section 47 consultees in response to the statutory consultation and the Applicants response.

1. What is your interest in the Scheme?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, a number ticked multiple options. As such, the below reflect a greater number of responses than submitted feedback:
14 respondents ticked 'Local resident'
3 respondents ticked 'Landowner'
1 respondents ticked 'Local elected representative'
1 respondent ticked 'Interested in solar power / renewable energy'

2. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation or group and if so, please share the name of the organisation or group.
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
14 respondents ticked 'No'
No respondents ticked 'Yes', or left additional feedback.

3. Are you happy for us to contact you about your response if required?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses was received:
11 respondents ticked 'Yes'
2 respondents ticked 'No'

4. Do you support the Dean Moor Solar Farm?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received: 4 respondents ticked 'Yes, wholly support' 3 respondents ticked 'Yes, but some concerns' 1 respondent ticked 'Neutral' 3 respondents ticked 'No, but I support solar generally' 3 respondents ticked 'No, not at all' *Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been removed. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.*

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**General**	**Yes, wholly support** - Support Green Energy and the fact that the farm can be decommissioned and the land reverting to its original state	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their support. At the end of the proposed 40-year operational period of the Dean Moor Solar Farm, it will be decommissioned, dismantled, and removed. The Site would be fully reinstated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority and returned to its current, solely agricultural use.
2	**Landscaping; Noise**	**No, but I support the development of solar farms generally** - Our property + land are located very close to the proposed solar farm. We are concerned about the visual impact, noise + property value	Yes	Following the statutory consultation the Applicant has increased the setback between the potential location of the closest solar arrays and the curtilage of the property in question to make use of the natural screening provided by topography. Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and is further outlined in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. The Battery Energy Storage System which was proposed for the

				Statutory Consultation, and described within the PEIR, and was the loudest source of operational noise has been removed from the Proposed Development. The Applicant acknowledges that the substation and inverters which are associated with solar arrays are a source of noise, although this is a low level, and is not expected to be a nuisance. The Development Consent Order will commit the Applicant to undertaking further assessment to consider the locations of these inverters and other sources of noise to avoid any adverse noise effects during operation.
3	**General**	**Neutral** - It is unclear if the benefits outweigh the impacts. Also, see later on battery facility	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The Planning Statement which is provided within the application balances the effects of the application against the benefits. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant took the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
4	**Biodiversity; Landscaping**	**Yes, wholly support** - we support the ethos of renewable energy. The land it will be placed on seems relatively underused. So long as the trees are kept!	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their support. As a general principle the Applicant is seeking to retain and enhance trees and hedgerows to improve habitats within the Site, and removal of mature trees would be avoided unless in exceptional circumstances. The Applicant notes that there are areas of commercial Sitka plantation within the southern part of the Site [referred to within the application as Area C], and that there will need to be ongoing maintenance of these trees, which may include felling. However, that activity is not linked to the Proposed Development. Further details on the tree maintenance and planting of trees for landscape screening or habitat enhancement purposes are provided

				in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and ES Chapter 8 – Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1].**
5	**Landscaping**	**Yes, but I have some concerns** - Some concerns, particularly about impact on landscape visually	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and is further outlined in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact within this DCO application.
6	**Location**	**No, but I support the development of solar farms generally** - I feel this development is too large and close to a small rural community	No	Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, this is further outlined in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]** including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including availability of on-site grid connection, solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties and expected low level of effects on landscape, ecology and heritage designations.
7	**Landscaping**	**Yes, but I have some concerns** - Being the owner of one of the four properties that will look directly onto the farm I have concerns around the visual impact, its effect on the value of my property and the effects on local life/travel/business.	No	The Applicant has considered the effects no views from nearby properties. The proposed Landscape Strategy Plan identifies the location of screening which has been included to minimise the visual impact on residents and the landscape. Further details of this are provided in ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2].** Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, this is further outlined in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility.

8	**Landscaping**	**No, but I support the development of solar farms generally** - I believe solar should not be on the land but factory roofs, or commercial properties but never on rural land. It is taking not giving back to nature Britain is a very small country, with less green space. I believe it is normal in German to use roofs rather than land.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveys and will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site, this is further outlined in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility. Whilst the Applicant believes that new domestic and all new commercial rooftops in the UK should have solar panels, this would still not be enough to meet the Government's carbon targets for 2050.
9	**Landscaping; Noise; Traffic and Access**	**No, not at all** – De-value of house eyesore/glare/ruin our view! Traffic and noise from works Entrance right opposite my entrance We already have wind turbines [noise/cause light flashes]	No	Whilst impact on the value of property is not a material planning consideration, there is no reason to expect that property values will be negatively affected. The general approach to minimising visual impacts was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact within this DCO application. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site, which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact.

10	**Landscaping**	**Yes, but have some concerns** - mainly around the visibility when completed	No	The general approach to minimising visual impacts was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact within this DCO application. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site, which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact.

5. Do you have any comments on the Concept Layout as outlined in the Dean Moor Solar Farm PEIR?
Where comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**General**	N/A	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback.
2	**Visual Impact**	Visual impact	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further outlined in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact within this DCO application. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact.
3	**General**	No	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback.
4	**Biodiversity**	keep the trees please.	No	As a general principle the Applicant is seeking to retain and enhance trees and hedgerows to improve habitats within the Site, and removal of mature trees would be avoided unless in exceptional circumstances. The Applicant notes that there are areas of commercial Sitka plantation within the southern part of the Site [referred to within the application as Area C], and that there will need to be ongoing maintenance of these trees, which may include felling. However, that activity is not linked to the Proposed Development. Further details on the tree maintenance and planting of trees for landscape screening or habitat enhancement purposes are provided in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity.

				Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach wasoutlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further outlined in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact within this DCO application.
5	**General**	Yes as above. Too large for the local area.	No	The scale of the Proposed Development responds to the commercial opportunity for the export of electricity to the local distribution network. The solar farm will assist in tackling the climate emergency and help the UK Government in meeting its target to reach net zero by 2050 and ambition to reach 70 gigawatts of installed solar capacity by 2035.
6	**Traffic and Access**	Access points off the Gilgarran Road for larger/HGV vehicles	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback and notes the preference for traffic and access routing. As a general principle, use of the Gilgarran Road would be minimised. HGVs and larger construction vehicles bringing equipment to Site would generally use the existing accesses on Branthwaite Road, and Branthwaite Edge Road to access the Primary Construction Compounds. However, the Applicant would need to bring equipment to construction compounds which are proposed to the north and south of Gilgarran Road to enable the construction in these areas. As a general principle the vehicles accessing these parts of the Site would be likely to be smaller vehicles transporting equipment from the Primary Compounds. Where the Gilgarran Road is used, the Applicant would seek to avoid busier periods to minimise disruption. The Applicant has prepared a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] which describes the arrangements to minimise the impact of construction traffic on the road network and nearby residents. The CTMP is outlined in ES Appendix 5.2 – outline Construction Traffic Management Plan ['CTMP'] [**REF: 6.3**].

7	**Biodiversity**	I am not in favour, the land is sacred to nature.	No	The land to be developed is currently in use as a sheep farm. In terms of the current natural value of the Site, the existing grassland within the Site is generally of a low species diversity due to the impact of grazing.
				The Applicant has assessed the effects on Biodiversity within the Environmental Statement outlined in ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]** and quantified the potential biodiversity benefits within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In general, the Proposed Development will result in a net gain significantly in excess of 10%, which is the guidance provided by national planning policy. A key change to the land use will be a reduction in grazing from sheep. This will result in an improvement of species diversity, and the establishment of natural corridors improving the habitat for wildlife within the Site.
8	**Visual Impact**	There needs to be wider margins between the solar arrays and private property	No	Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site, which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. The Proposed Development includes setbacks, including screening which provide a buffer between dwellings and the solar arrays and associated development. Further details of this are provided in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**.
9	**General**	No	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback.
10	**Location**	Yes, move the site. Many more better sites closer to the Grid and wasteland!	No	Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, including a description of reasonable alternatives. This is further outlined in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]**. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility to the strategic road network.

11	**Location**	Yes! Move closer to the grid or move to waste site. I feel it's the wrong site for such a project.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveys and will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site. This is further outlined in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility to the strategic road network.
12	**General**	N/A	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback.

6. Cultural heritage and archaeology: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to cultural heritage and archaeological protection and enhancement?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 6 respondents ticked 'Agree'
· 5 respondents ticked 'Neither agree nor disagree'
· 1 respondent ticked 'Disagree'
· 2 respondents ticked 'Strongly disagree'
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Cultural and Archaeology**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - There is no commitment, only an aspiration, to improve access to the stone circle and cairn	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback. The Applicant is proposing two new permissive paths through the Site would be established, including a permissive path between Gilgarran Road and Dean Cross Road, to the south of the Site via the Stone Circle. The inclusion of these Permissive Paths would be secured by the DCO, so this is a legal commitment, subject to approval.
2	**Cultural and Archaeology**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - acknowledgement of the stone circle being on site should be promoted too.	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback. Along with the permissive path which will enable access to the Stone Circle, the Applicant is proposing signage and information boards for educational and wider public benefit. The Applicant is proposing two new permissive paths through the Site would be established, including a permissive path between Gilgarran Road and Dean Cross Road, to the south of the Site via the Stone Circle. The inclusion of these Permissive Paths would be secured by the DCO, so this is a legal commitment, subject to approval.
3	**Cultural and Archaeology**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - Limited information on what extra measures may or may not be taken in the future	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback. We hope the other responses outline the additional measures which have been developed between the Preliminary Environmental Information Report presented at the Statutory Consultation and the Environmental Impact Assessment presented at submission. The Applicant is proposing two new permissive paths through the Site would be established, including a permissive path between

				Gilgarran Road and Dean Cross Road, to the south of the Site via the Stone Circle. The inclusion of these Permissive Paths would be secured by the DCO, so this is a legal commitment, subject to approval.
4	**Cultural and Archaeology**	**Agree** - I wonder if there will be any unexpected archaeological finds	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback. The Applicant would be committed to undertaking trial trenching to assess the presence of any archaeological remains in those areas where the previously undertaken geophysical surveys of the Site indicate there may be some potential. This would be undertaken prior to construction. Any potential archaeological finds will be documented as outlined in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy, which is found in ES Appendix 6.3 – Archaeological Mitigation Strategy **[REF: 6.3].**
5	**Cultural and Archaeology**	**Neither agree nor disagree/disagree** - I didn't know about the stone circle, access would be good, not sure I want to walk through solar panels to access though. Will the access be taken away later down the line? In Gilgarran we have had former promises, that have been taken away or never actioned by the same landowners and house developers.	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their feedback. Neither of the proposed Permissive Paths are surrounded by Solar Arrays along their entire length. The proposed Permissive Path along the existing track between Gilgarran Road and Potato Pot Wind Farm would have solar arrays to the south and west. Views of the solar arrays may be screened by vegetation. The proposed Permissive Path between Gilgarran Road and Dean Cross Road is located along the western edge of the Site, adjacent to Ancient Woodland [where no solar arrays would be present], and partly within the area of Green Infrastructure, where no solar arrays will be present. The proposed Permissive Paths are detailed within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, within ES Appendix 7.7 – outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [“LEMP”]**[REF 6.3]**. The draft Development Consent Order will commit the Applicant to implementing these Permissive Paths for the operational life of the Proposed Development, which is 40 years.

6	**Cultural and Archaeology**	**Strongly disagree** - Best option to minimise environmental impacts is to build it elsewhere. We have lots of wildlife, a lovely view of the moor and want to keep it that way!	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings or sensitive viewpoints. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and is further detailed in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. The Applicant has assessed the effects on Biodiversity in the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**, and quantified the potential biodiversity benefits within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In general, the Proposed Development will result in a net gain significantly in excess of 10%, which is the guidance provided by national planning policy. A key change to the land use will be a reduction in grazing from sheep. This will result in an improvement of species diversity, and the establishment of natural corridors improving the habitat for wildlife within the Site.
7	**General**	**Strongly disagree** - Pick somewhere else and leave the site alone no need to minimize impacts	No	Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, including a description of reasonable alternatives. This is further outlined in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility to the strategic road network.

7. Landscape and visual impact: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to landscape mitigation and enhancement?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Strongly agree’
· 3 respondents ticked ‘Agree’
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Neither agree nor disagree’
· 3 respondent ticked ‘Disagree’
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Strongly disagree’
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Visual Impact**	**Disagree** - Very concerned about the visual impact. The battery store is large + unsightly+ will be very hard to hide. Don't think current proposal is enough and concerned by this	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further outlined in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant took the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
2	**Visual Impact**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - See comments on glint and glare	No	A Glint and Glare Assessment has been prepared and submitted with the Application in ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**, this has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within the Landscape Strategy Plan, outlined in ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. The

				assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated.
3	**Access**	**Agree** - good idea to provide permissive paths.	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their support for the proposed new permissive paths.
4	**Visual Impact, Biodiversity and Ecology**	**Strongly Agree** - Maximum amount of screening possible to reduce any visual impact and provide additional habitats for nature	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which is further detailed in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**.
5	**General**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - Future developments and enhancements are unclear	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their comment. The DCO application is for the solar farm consulted upon only. Any future development would require separate planning permission through the planning system.
6	**Visual Impact**	**Disagree** - From the position of my property, I will be able to look down on the area closest to Gilgarran village. Especially whilst <illegible>	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. The Applicant has provided visualisations which provide an indicative representation of what the development would look like from affected views, including from viewpoints near Gilgarran. These viewpoints include proposed landscape screening. However, it is acknowledged that the proposed solar arrays would be visible from viewpoints in and around Gilgarran. The Applicant has engaged and will continue to engage with local households after the submission of the application.

7	**Access; Biodiversity and Ecology**	**Disagree** - From a mental and wellbeing perspective many people from the area use the lane to run/walk/bike. It is already beautiful and rich in nature without the solar farm. What would the solar farm do for birds/squirrels/deer/other wildlife? For me I feel it would be damaging.	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and is further detailed in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. The Applicant has also undertaken extensive bird and wildlife surveying and proposed both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the Biodiversity Chapter in the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**.
8	**Visual Impact**	It is difficult to judge because boundary hedges and screening trees will take many years to mature. In key areas I suggest that you invest in semi mature trees and quick growing hedges etc	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings or sensitive viewpoints. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. The Applicant has provided further details of the proposed landscape screening and tree planting within the LEMP which is submitted for consent. The Development Consent Order will require the Applicant to submit a LEMP to the Council for approval prior to construction. In terms of the species of trees and hedges to be implemented, the Applicant will also be considering the biodiversity benefit of the species selected for screening purposes. These are likely to include native species. the speed in which any proposed hedgerows or trees mature is not the only consideration.

9	**Visual Impact; Traffic and Access**	**Strongly disagree** - My garden is our favourite part of the house. The view over the moor at dusk is lovely. We will lose this! The tree cover we have is dead standing and would take 40-50 years to replace. Traffic management plan is a joke on your consultation visuals [will not work!] Solar glare survey is based on a guess under the limit for mitigation - a lie I would say!	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings or sensitive viewpoints. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. The Applicant is not proposing to remove any mature trees or hedgerows. As a general principle where existing trees are present the Applicant is keen to retain these for screening purposes. The Applicant has prepared a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) **[REF: 6.3]** following consultation that will reduce the impact of construction upon residents. The Glint and Glare Assessment, which was provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, and can be found in the ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**, during the statutory consultation has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within the Landscape Strategy Plan. The assessment has been undertaken by an industry leading consultant in accordance with the established methodology and best practice. This considers the impacts from key receptor locations [i.e. dwellings], which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity. The Landscape Strategy Plan can be found in ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**.
10	**Visual Impact**	**Strongly disagree** - no consideration has been	No	The Applicant has engaged and will continue to engage with local households after the submission of the application.

		giving to the people who live here. Our garden faces the moor with a lovely view. The tree cover we have is mostly dead standing and does not match the visual impact surver you have based it on. Solar glare surver is based on prediction, we want evidence based trails.		Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings or sensitive viewpoints. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within the DCO application. The Applicant is not proposing to remove any mature trees or hedgerows to enable development. As a general principle where existing trees are present the Applicant is committed to retain these for screening purposes, or to enhance the connectivity between habitat on Site and off site. A Glint and Glare Assessment has been prepared and submitted with the Application, further details can be found in ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment, this has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within the Landscape Strategy Plan, details of which can be found in in the ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. The assessment has been undertaken by an industry leading consultant in accordance with the established methodology and best practice. This considers the impacts from key receptor locations [i.e. dwellings], which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity.
11	**Visual Impact**	**Agree** - Agree you will do the best possible, but still wonder how visible this will be?	No	Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings or sensitive viewpoints. This

				general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed in the in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within the DCO application. However, it will not be possible to completely block all views of solar arrays from all perspectives, the landscape strategy is to soften the impact and integrate the solar farm into the landscape, rather than prevent any views of the Proposed Development.

8. Biodiversity: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to ecological mitigation and enhancement?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Strongly agree’
· 5 respondents ticked ‘Agree’
· 3 respondents ticked ‘Neither agree nor disagree’
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Disagree’
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Strongly disagree’
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**General**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - The booklet implies reduction in use of the land for farming is only a benefit	No	The solar farm will assist in tackling the climate emergency and help the UK Government in meeting its target to reach net zero by 2050 and ambition to reach 70 gigawatts of installed solar capacity by 2035. The Applicant intends to use sheep for landscape maintenance purposes during the operational life of the Proposed Development, so agricultural activities [particularly sheep grazing] will reduce, but not cease. The existing farm is excluded from the Proposed Development and will be retained. Indeed, the existing farm may be involved in maintenance grazing and other landscape management activities on Site.
2	**Landscaping**	**Agree** - good to see plans in place to maintain the landscape and offer it some protection	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their support.
3	**Biodiversity and Ecology**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - Future impact and detriment to the present biodiversity is unclear as the project is developed	No	The Applicant has assessed the effects within the Biodiversity Chapter in the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity and quantified the potential biodiversity benefits within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In general, the Proposed Development will result in a net gain significantly in excess of 10%, which is the guidance provided by national planning policy. A key change to the land use will be a reduction in grazing from sheep. This will result in an improvement of species diversity, and the establishment of natural corridors improving the habitat for wildlife within the Site.
4	**General**	**Agree** - no additional comments	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their response.
5	**General**	**Disagree** - Answer is the same as Answer 7 [*From the position of my property, I will be able to look down on the area closest to Gilgarran village. Especially whilst <illegible>*]	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

6	**Biodiversity and Ecology**	**Strongly disagree** - Solar panels and battery storgage facility don't mix at all with biodiversity no matter how you try and put it. Wrong site! No trees will be removed, then you on to say ""the farmer may cut the trees for firewood"" so likely the trees will go!	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. The Applicant will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. Further details of this are provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and the Biodiversity Chapter in the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**. The Applicant notes that there are areas of commercial Sitka plantation within the southern part of the Site [referred to within the application as Area C], and that there will need to be ongoing maintenance of these trees, which may include felling. However, that activity is not linked the Proposed Development. These areas of existing Woodland are excluded from Works Area 1 Solar Infrastructure, which defines where solar arrays can be established. The Development Consent Order will legally require the Applicant to avoid panels in these areas for the duration of the operational life of the Proposed Development.
7	**Biodiversity and Ecology**	**Strongly Disagree** - Any built environment on site will have a negative impact. You say no trees will get removed, but then say the farmer may cut them for fire wood or too make space for more panels, most likely! Negative impact to birds of prey that we have.	No	As a general principle the Applicant is seeking to retain and enhance trees and hedgerows to improve habitats within the Site, and removal of mature trees would be avoided unless in exceptional circumstances. The Applicant notes that there are areas of commercial Sitka plantation within the southern part of the Site [referred to within the application as Area C], and that there will need to be ongoing maintenance of these trees, which may include felling. However, that activity is not linked the Proposed Development. These areas of existing Woodland are excluded from Works Area 1 Solar Infrastructure, which defines where solar arrays can be established. The Development Consent Order will legally require

				the Applicant to avoid panels in these areas for the duration of the operational life of the Proposed Development. Further details on the tree maintenance and planting of trees for landscape screening or habitat enhancement purposes are provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**. The impact on birds, including birds of prey [such as Hen Harrier, of which there are established local populations] are considering in the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity.

9. Access, traffic and transportation: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to traffic mitigation?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 1 respondent ticked 'Strongly agree'
· 5 respondents ticked 'Agree'
· 2 respondents ticked 'Neither agree nor disagree'
· 2 respondents ticked 'Disagree'
· 2 respondents ticked 'Strongly disagree'
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**General**	The current proposal would not really affect us	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
2	**Traffic and Access**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - In the booklet it is stated that construction 'would be able to access the site without having to travel through the narrow roads within nearby villages'! This seems carefully worded to avoid a commitment. The booklet does no state how the CTMP would be enforced in practice. It is unclear if restrictions will only apply to HGVs and not for example to construction staff. The road from Lillyhall is hazardous, involving a hidden dip + a bend on which there has been a fatal accident.	No	It is acknowledged that the wording provided could be read in the way the respondent has alluded to, however that is certainly not the Applicant's intent. The key point is that construction traffic would access the Site from the Lillyhall Roundabout along the Branthwaite and Branthwaite Edge Roads because that is the shortest route to the A595, and the Strategic Road Network, and more suitable for large vehicles. Construction traffic would not need to travel via villages, such as Gilgarran and Branthwaite. To be clear, however, the Applicant will be committed to ensuring all construction traffic avoids the villages in question. The Applicant has prepared a CTMP, following consultation that described the restrictions that the Applicant is committed to in terms of reducing the impact of construction traffic upon residents. The routing and guidance outlined in the CTMP will be adhered to by all construction traffic during the construction period. Feedback from the community has been helpful to the Applicant in preparing the CTMP and understanding the local road network.

3	**Traffic and Access**	**Disagree** - we are concerned about access and disruption to our local areas. The road from the A595 [Branthwaite Rd] is dreadful, dangerous and poorly signed. One of the signs which does say no HGV's not adhered to at all, many vehicles do not observe their lanes either. Extra construction traffic does not bode well for these roads.	No	See previous response. The Applicant has prepared a CTMP, following consultation that will reduce the impact of construction upon residents. The routing and guidance outlined in the CTMP will be adhered to by all visitors to Site during the construction period. Feedback from the community has been helpful to the Applicant in preparing the CTMP and understanding the local road network.
4	**Traffic and Access**	**Disagree** - The access roads, especially Gilgarran road would be heavily affected by the construction traffic which would cause degradation of the already poor road surface and cut up grass verges	Yes	The Applicant has prepared a CTMP following consultation that will reduce the impact of construction upon residents. The local highways network has been consulted on the proposals, their response may be found above.
5	**Traffic and Access**	**Agree** - As long as contractors/staff/visitors to the project stick to the routes and access points highlighted. Concerned around condition, sustainability of the current Gilgarran to Branthwaite Edge Road, that is already in poor condition and will only get worse. Same with roads verges.	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their support. The routing and guidance outlined in the CTMP will be adhered to by all visitors to site during the construction period. As a general principle, use of the Gilgarran Road/ Collingate Road would be minimised. HGVs and larger construction vehicles transporting equipment to Site would generally use the existing accesses on Branthwaite Road, and Branthwaite Edge Road to access the Primary Construction Compounds. However, the Applicant would need to bring equipment to construction compounds which are proposed to the north and south of Gilgarran Road to enable the construction in these areas. As a general principle the vehicles accessing these parts of the Site would be likely to be smaller vehicles transporting equipment from the Primary Compounds. Where the Gilgarran Road is used, the Applicant would seek to avoid busier periods to minimise disruption.

				The Applicant will work with the Local Highway Authority [LHA] regarding the condition of the road network, including the Gilgarran Road/ Collingate Road. Where the road or verges are affected by construction activities these will be repaired through agreement with the LHA. The LHA has been consulted on the proposals, their response may be found above . Where necessary, the Applicant will be working with the LHA to secure consent for temporary traffic management arrangements affecting the road network.
6	**Traffic and Access**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - To be considered many people in Gilgarran use the Gilgarran Rd to go to school in Dean, I do not think there is one child in the village that goes to Distington so this rd is used as the main rd through to go to Dean Primary School. Schools/work rush needs to be taken into consideration.	No	The Applicant's Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] commits to ensuring deliveries to the Site will be outside of peak times such as school drop-off periods and rush hour.
7	**Traffic and Access**	**Agree** - It is important to maintain a suitable feedback loop and liaison group for the duration of the installation works etc so that any changes to the agreed plan can be spotted and responded to rapidly. Also any unauthorised deviations can be resolved before they cause unnecessary resentment	No	The Applicant notes the desire for a community liaison during the construction period. The Applicant would be seeking to establish a community liaison group to ensure that there is a means to raise issues experience by the community during construction.
8	**Traffic and Access**	**Strongly disagree** - Entrance opposite my site entrance this will restrict what we do on our	No	The Applicant has prepared a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] following consultation that will reduce the impact of construction upon residents. This would include the consideration

		already built site that we live in. Gilgarran exit/road dangerous now and will only be worse! Wrong site! Site is not fit for large scale HGV use		of speed and safety, and the appropriate traffic management arrangements, which could include temporary speed restrictions at the Gilgarran Road/ Branthwaite Edge Road junction. A number of potential Site accesses are proposed within the application, including additional locations to those proposed within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. The final selection of the Site accesses will be undertaken with consideration of safety, including the relationship with existing accesses. Any restrictions to existing accesses would be avoided through design. The Local Highway Authority has been consulted regarding the Proposed Development, their response may be found above.
9	**Traffic and Access**	**Strongly disagree** - Entrance opposite ours, will restrict what we do on site The traffic management plan proposed is a joke. The roads are not fit for HGVs and heavy plant. Gilgarran exit road is dangerous now and will only get worse. The traffic plan will mean it would take 10 years to build and this is likely to be untrue to get it through planning	No	A number of potential Site accesses are proposed, including additional locations to those proposed within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. The final selection of the Site accesses will be undertaken with consideration of safety, including the relationship with existing accesses. Any restrictions to existing accesses would be avoided through design. The Applicant has prepared a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] following consultation that will reduce the impact of construction upon residents. The local Highways Network has been consulted on the proposals, their response may be found above. There will be a requirement for appropriate traffic management arrangements to be agreed with the Local Highways Authority prior to commencement. However, access to the Site is generally considered to be good, and not likely to cause a significant delay to construction.

10. Glint and glare: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to glint and glare mitigation?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 1 respondent ticked 'Strongly agree'
· 4 respondents ticked 'Agree'
· 4 respondents ticked 'Neither agree nor disagree'
· 1 respondent ticked 'Disagree'
· 3 respondents ticked 'Strongly disagree'
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Visual Impact**	**Strongly disagree** - Pg38 Screening for dwellings 26-32 The screening proposed does not screen our view of the solar farm facing towards the road from our house	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveys and will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. The Applicant has engaged and will continue to engage with local households after the submission of the application.
2	**Visual Impact**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - the booklet does not address impacts from the hills to the east of the site.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact. This will include screening around the site to prevent impact on local views, as well as views from the Lake District National Park, who have provided comments during the consultation. These may be found above along with the Applicant's response.
3	**Visual Impact**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - we are not sure about this at all. We are glad you are giving thought to this though so there are risks.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**.

				The Glint and Glare Assessment which was provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during the statutory consultation has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within the Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. Further details of the Glint and Glare Assessment can be found in ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. This considers the impact on dwellings and road users, which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity.
4	**Visual Impact**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - Insufficient detail or knowledge of the possible effects of glint and glare from the panels	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**. The Glint and Glare Assessment, further details of which can be found in ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**, which was provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during the statutory consultation has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within in the ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. This considers the impact on dwellings and road users, which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity.
5	**General**	**Agree** - No additional comments.	No	The Applicant thanks the respondent for their support.

6	**Biodiversity and Ecology**	**Disagree** - You have only informed on the dwellings of humans. However, we have rich bird life/nature in this area. What are the effects on their dwellings/life. It is the same villages that will try to take the funding, Distington and Dean, however Gilgarran/Branthwaite/Pica never seem to get anything for our villages.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the Biodiversity Chapter in the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**. The Applicant has noted the comment regarding the community benefit fund, and thanks the respondent for their response. The discussion of the proposed community benefits is ongoing and will continue outside of the formal DCO application.
7	**Visual Impact**	**Strongly disagree** - will be awful from my house, we already have turbine noise, flashes as the blades go past. Again, wrong site pick another I am no 28 on map! Zoom from my house. Survey based on prediction, we want clear trials and evidence. Not a guess that works for you.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveys and will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. The Applicant has engaged and will continue to engage with local households after the submission of the application. The Glint and Glare Assessment, which was provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during the statutory consultation has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within in the Landscape Strategy Plan, details of which are found at ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. This considers the impact on dwellings and road users, which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity.
8	**Visual Impact**	**Strongly disagree** - we already have wind turbine flash of the blades going past our windows	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveys and will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. The Applicant has engaged and will continue to engage with local households after the submission of the application.

		Survey is based on predictions under the limit for mitigation. I feel this is untrue and should be based on evidence backed trials.		The Glint and Glare Assessment, can also be found in ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment **[REF: 6.2]**, which was provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during the statutory consultation has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within in the Landscape Strategy Plan, ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. This considers the impact on dwellings and road users, which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity.

11. Battery safety: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to battery safety?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Strongly agree’
· 4 respondents ticked ‘Agree’
· 3 respondents ticked ‘Neither agree nor disagree’
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Disagree’
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Strongly disagree’
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Safety**	**Disagree** - At the consultation event it was implied the battery	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the

		facility will not be built anytime soon. The booklet states the capacity will be 100 MW. This is meaningless. Watts is a unit of power not energy.		decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
2	**Safety**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - safety first	No	The Applicant is committed to safe working in construction and operation and will be undertaking those works in accordance with the appropriate health and safety regulations. However, the consideration of safety during construction is not directly a matter for planning. The impact of construction and operational traffic on road users is considered in the CTMP. The potential impact on the health, including effects on construction workers is considered in the Environmental Statement. Further details of this are outlined in ES Chapter 5 - Construction and Decommissioning Methodology and Phasing **[REF: 6.1]**. Should the application have included a Battery Energy Storage System, Battery Safety Management Plan would have been prepared. However, this is no longer required.
3	**Safety**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - Insufficient knowledge to form opinion on this subject	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
4	**Safety**	**Agree** - only concern is length of time it would take Cumbria Fire and Rescue service to attend	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the

		location. Also have minor worries around theft / vandalism / protest.		Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. The Applicant will also ensure the security of the Proposed Development, further details of the fencing and other security arrangements [such as cameras] are outlined in the Development Description.
5	**Noise**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - Will there be a lot of noise?	No	A Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared to consider how noise effects on residents can be avoided. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. Works Area 2, which defines where Grid Infrastructure including the substation could be located has been selected in an central area of the Site which is furthest from existing dwellings. The location of the substation will ensure any significant noise effects are avoided. Further consideration of noise effects will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure other sources of noise do not adversely effect nearby dwellings. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. The Battery Energy Storage System was a particular source of noise, to a greater extent than the proposed substation, so this further decreases the impact from noise associated with the proposal.
6	**Safety**	**Agree** - The provision of adequate supplies of cooling water to prevent fire spreading might require one or two storage ponds to be included in the landscaping.	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.

				Should the application have included a Battery Energy Storage System, Battery Safety Management Plan would have been prepared. However, this is no longer required. The Applicant will also ensure the security of the Proposed Development, further details of the fencing and other security arrangements [such as cameras] are outlined in the Development Description.
7	**Safety**	**Strongly disagree** - Will never be as safe as it is now - with no battery storage on site	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. Should the application have included a Battery Energy Storage System, Battery Safety Management Plan would have been prepared. However, this is no longer required.
8	**Safety**	**Strongly disagree** - Safest it can ever be now with no batterys on site.	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. Should the application have included a Battery Energy Storage System, Battery Safety Management Plan would have been prepared. However, this is no longer required.

12. Noise: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to noise impact assessment and mitigation?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Strongly agree’
· 3 respondents ticked ‘Agree’
· 5 respondents ticked ‘Neither agree nor disagree’
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Disagree’
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Strongly disagree’
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Noise**	**neither agree nor disagree** - Unsure on noise level	No	A Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared to consider how noise effects on residents can be avoided. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. Works Area 2, which defines where Grid Infrastructure including the substation could be located has been selected in a central area of the Site which is furthest from existing dwellings. The location of the

				substation will ensure any significant noise effects are avoided. Further consideration of noise effects will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure other sources of noise do not adversely affect nearby dwellings. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. The Battery Energy Storage System was a particular source of noise, to a greater extent than the proposed substation, so this further decreases the impact from noise associated with the proposal.
2	**Noise**	**neither agree nor disagree** - Insufficient knowledge or experience of these features to form an opinion	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
3	**Noise**	**Agree** - No further comment	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
4	**Noise; Biodiversity**	**neither agree nor disagree** - I have no idea what to expect, will there be a constant hum? Will this harm nature or people from walks etc Will people still be able to hear bird song? I feel in this area, this could be forever changed	No	A Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared to consider how noise effects on residents can be avoided. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. Works Area 2, which defines where Grid Infrastructure including the substation could be located has been selected in a central area of the Site which is furthest from existing dwellings. The location of the substation will ensure any significant noise effects are avoided. Further consideration of noise effects will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure other sources of noise do not adversely affect nearby dwellings. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. The Battery Energy Storage System was a particular source of noise, to a greater extent

				than the proposed substation, so this further decreases the impact from noise associated with the proposal. There is no anticipated harm to humans from solar panels. The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the Biodiversity Chapter in the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**.
5	**Noise**	**Agree** - Where appropriate noise absorbing screens should be erected in the direction of nearby habitation.	No	The Applicant has proposed to have the ability to establish acoustic barriers, where required. However, it is anticipated that the need for any such barriers can be avoided through appropriate placement of the inverters associated with the solar arrays. Noise from the proposed substation or solar array inverters are not currently expected to generate the need for noise attenuation in the form of acoustic barriers. The Applicant is committed [and would be required by the DCO] to an additional Noise Impact Assessment, which would inform the design of the Proposed Development, and ensure the placement of noisier equipment within parts of the Site where no adverse noise affects to nearby dwellings would occur due to the distance involved. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**.
6	**Traffic and Access; Noise**	**Strongly disagree** - I live here and enjoy how natural and silent it is. Timescale 8-18 months of heavy plant, HGVs, roadworks, Don't even think you have thought about the residents in the area.	No	A Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared to consider how noise effects on residents can be avoided. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. Works Area 2, which defines where Grid Infrastructure including the substation could be located has been selected in a central area of the Site which is furthest from existing dwellings. The location of the substation will ensure any significant noise effects are avoided. Further consideration of noise effects will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure other sources of noise do not adversely affect nearby dwellings. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery

				Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. The Battery Energy Storage System was a particular source of noise, to a greater extent than the proposed substation, so this further decreases the impact from noise associated with the proposal. The Applicant has prepared a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] following consultation that will reduce the impact of construction traffic upon residents. As part of the CTMP, deliveries to the Site will be outside of peak times such as school drop-off periods and rush hour.
7	**Traffic and Access; Noise**	**Strongly disagree** - no thought has been giving to the people who live here. Time scale is 18 month roughly. This does not line up with the traffic plan. How can you make a noise plan without coming to visit us who live here?	No	The Noise Impact Assessment has been informed by surveys which were undertaken on Site, and at other locations close to sensitive locations [nearer to dwellings]. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. The Applicant has constructed a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] following consultation that will reduce the impact of construction upon residents. As part of the CTMP, deliveries to the Site will be outside of peak times such as school drop-off periods and rush hour.
8	**Noise**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - Need to fully understand what noise is generated.	No	A Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared to consider how noise effects on residents can be avoided. Works Area 2, which defines where Grid Infrastructure including the substation could be located has been selected in a central area of the Site which is furthest from existing dwellings. The location of the substation will ensure any significant noise effects are avoided. Further consideration of noise effects will be undertaken prior to construction to ensure other sources of noise do not adversely affect nearby dwellings. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**.

A 13. Flood risk, drainage and water quality: Based on the information provided do you agree with our proposed approach to flood risk management and surface water drainage strategy?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Strongly agree’
· 7 respondents ticked ‘Agree’
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Neither agree nor disagree’
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Strongly disagree’
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Flood Risk, Hydrology, and Drainage**	We do hope the water quality is improved. We do not need more spoiled water systems, there are too many already. We also believe that monitoring is ESSENTIAL. We do not need more flooding around here and in the villages.	No	The Applicant has prepared a Water Framework Directive Assessment which considers the effects of the Proposed Development on water quality. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.3 – Water Framework Directive Assessment [WFD’] [**RE: 6.3**]. In general, the reduction in sheep grazing within the Site will decrease effluent flowing into the watercourses within the Site, which in turn flow into the River Derwent and the River Marron. The proposed solar arrays and substation are not a significant source of pollution, as any sources of pollution are enclosed within buildings. Given the scale and nature of the catchment wide issues with water quality, the improvement in water quality on the streams within the Site would not affect a change in the status of water quality issues on these rivers overall.

				We have prepared a Flood Risk Assessment ['FRA'] and outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy ['oSWDS'] to consider the risks from flooding and describe the arrangements to manage surface water runoff. In general, the Proposed Development avoids areas of impermeable surfacing which would reduce infiltration and contribute to increased flood risk. Further details of these can be found in ES Appendix 2.4 – Flood Risk Assessment [FRA AND oSWDS] [**REF: 6.3**]. Both the FRA and the oSWDS have been updated following consultation to incorporate the advice of statutory consultees and professional bodies.
2	**Flood Risk, Hydrology, and Drainage**	**Agree** - Proposed details appear satisfactory at this time	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
3	**Flood Risk, Hydrology, and Drainage**	**Agree** - No major concerns as long as current waterways are protected or if diverted then done so in an environmental manner.	No	No waterways would be diverted. Where there are streams within the Site, the Applicant will be required to secure consent for any development within 8m of those watercourses.
4	**Flood Risk, Hydrology, and Drainage**	**Strongly Disagree** - The fields hold a lot of water. I worry especially during the winter.	No	We have prepared a Flood Risk Assessment ['FRA'] and outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy ['oSWDS'] to consider the risks from flooding and describe the arrangements to manage surface water runoff. Both the FRA and the oSWDS have been updated following consultation to incorporate the advice of statutory consultees and professional bodies. Further details of these can be found in ES Appendix 2.4 – Flood Risk Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**.
5	**Flood Risk, Hydrology, and Drainage**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - N/A	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

6	**Flood Risk, Hydrology, and Drainage**	**Neither agree nor disagree** - N/A	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

14. Do you have any comments on the information presented in our Preliminary Environmental Information Report? Please specify any environmental topic areas you are commenting on.
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Climate change’
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Health’
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Waste’
· 6 respondents ticked ‘Social-economics and land use’
· No respondents ticked ‘Soils and agricultural land’
· No respondents ticked ‘Air quality’
· 1 respondent ticked ‘Other [please specify]’, specifying ‘Water quality and flooding’
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**General**	None at this stage	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

2	**General**	No	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
3	**Socio-economic**	**Social-economics and land use** - Bringing industry into this farming area is a change of use of land and will inevitably lead to more commerce. Ok, so the rest of us in the area must be afforded the same leeway.	No	The application for the Dean Moor Solar Farm is for a temporary solar PV array for the duration of 40 years, after which the Applicant will be required to return to its current use, including restoration. As such the land grading and land use would not be permanently changed as a result of this development.
4	**Cultural and Archaeology**	**Social-economics and land use** - providing path loops within the site would be a real benefit, but only if connected to local villages including Branthwaite.	No	The Applicant is proposing two new permissive paths through the Site would be established, including a permissive path between Gilgarran Road and Dean Cross Road, to the south of the Site via the Stone Circle. The inclusion of these Permissive Paths would be secured by the DCO, so this is a legal commitment, subject to approval. The Site does not include sufficient land to enable a new Permissive Path between Gilgarran and Branthwaite. However, the Applicant is aware of informal paths north of the Gilgarran/ Collingate Road which may be used to travel between Gilgarran, and towards a Public Right of Way between Branthwaite Edge Road and Branthwaite. These informal paths currently have no formal status as Public Rights of Way. Where such paths are within the Site, the Applicant will avoid establishing any new impediments to access, such a fencing.
5	**Flood Risk, Hydrology, and Drainage**	**Climate change; Waste; Other [Water quality and flooding]** - We need renewable energy such as this. We need to recognise climate is changing and whether this will have a future impact on that change.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

6	**Socio-economic**	**Social-economics and land use** - Will there be any direct social/economic benefit to the immediate community [i.e. Gilgarran] or will this be spread over the whole area and be of little direct benefit to the Gilgarran community.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. There would not be a permanent presence of employees on Site during operation, and the solar farm and substation would be operated remotely. However, there would be an ongoing need for maintenance, including of landscaping during the 40-year operational life of the Proposed Development. The Applicant's intention is to seek to use a local workforce to provide these services where possible. The solar farm would generate renewable energy which would be distributed principally on the local distribution network, so the local community would benefit from a reduction in the carbon intensity of local energy generation. Solar energy is recognised as being one of the cheapest forms of energy generation, and at a national level such development is expected to reduce energy costs in the long term as the country reduces its reliance on imported natural gas. The discussion of the proposed community benefits is ongoing, including with parish councils, and will continue separately to the DCO application.
7	**General**	No comments	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
8	**Socio-economic, visual impact**	**Social-economics and land use; Health** - Noise, glint and glare, flooding [wildlife and humans alike] Will this impact what people use the area for mental and physical health	No	The Applicant is proposing two new permissive paths through the Site would be established, including a permissive path between Gilgarran Road and Dean Cross Road, to the south of the Site via the Stone Circle. Establishing these new paths will provide a mental and physical health benefit to nearby residents.

10	**Socio-economic**	**Social-economics and land use** - It is already clear that a number of local farmers etc are opposed to the project because of the perceived reduction in agricultural yield of the land under the arrays. Consideration needs to be given to boost the productivity of other local land to rebalance the equation.	No	The solar farm will assist in tackling the climate emergency and help the UK Government in meeting its target to reach net zero by 2050 and ambition to reach 70 gigawatts of installed solar capacity by 2035.
11	**General**	N/A	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

15. Community benefit fund: As part of this scheme, we are exploring the use of a community benefit fund, and our aim is to work with organisations that will spend the money to support the projects to benefit the local community. We would like to understand what causes are important to you. Please indicate which causes you feel the benefit fund should support. [Please tick as many boxes as needed].
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 8 respondents ticked 'Environment'
· 7 respondents ticked 'Community healthcare'
· 8 respondents ticked 'Wildlife'
· 4 respondents ticked 'Combating climate change'
· 6 respondents ticked 'Education'
· 1 respondent ticked 'Other [please specify]'
Where respondents ticked 'Other [please specify]', or provided additional information, these have been reproduced in the table below.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Socio-economic**	Connecting our rural areas with good internet	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The Applicant does not have any influence over the provision of internet access locally. However, the discussion of the proposed community benefits is ongoing, and will continue outside of the formal DCO application. It is possible that the parish councils could use the community benefit fund to support the improvements to internal access.
2	**Socio-economic**	The benefit should be to the immediate community impacted.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The discussion of the proposed community benefits is ongoing and will continue outside of the formal DCO application. The Applicant has engaged with Dean and Distington Parish Councils Working Group in discussion over the community benefit proposals, to ensure these are appropriate for those most impacted by the Proposed Development.
3	**Socio-economic**	Other - Recreation and Sports	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The discussion of the proposed community benefits is ongoing and will continue outside of the formal DCO application.
4	**Socio-economic**	We have a community fund from the wind turbines thanks.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The current community benefit fund sits at over £1 million; discussions are ongoing with local political stakeholders about how this will be distributed across the community and as this sits outside the formal application they will continue after submission of the application.

16. Do you have any other comments you wish to make about Dean Moor Solar Farm?
Where comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	**Socio-economic**	The benefits seem overstated. If only two vehicles are visiting per month as stated, it is difficult to any sufficient number of local jobs being created. £500,000 seems a very small benefit over a 40-yr lifetime	No	The Applicant notes the comment and has developed a robust needs case for the Proposed Development. The solar farm will assist in tackling the climate emergency and help the UK Government in meeting its target to reach net zero by 2050 and ambition to reach 70 gigawatts of installed solar capacity by 2035. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be no permanent presence of staff on Site, and the solar farm and substation would generally be monitored remotely. However, there will be an ongoing need for landscape and other maintenance activities on Site, and where possible local people would be employed to provide these services. The current community benefit fund sits at over £1 million, discussions are ongoing with local political stakeholders about how this will be distributed across the community and as this sits outside the formal application they will continue after submission of the application.
2	**General**	We hope that it is a success	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their support.
3	**Visual Impact**	Although I am in agreement in principal, I have yet to be really convinced that there will not be a detrimental visual impact on the local area/landscape. Your booklet sounds wonderful but …..... What happens to the panels at the end of		Landscape screening is proposed in various locations around the Site to reduce the visibility of the solar arrays and other buildings and equipment from nearby dwellings. This general approach was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further detailed within in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact. within this DCO application **[REF: 6.1]**. Most of the materials within the solar panels can be recycled.

		their life? Can they be recycled?		
4	**Visual Impact**	I feel that development is far too big and will have a detrimental effect on the rural feeling of the area.	No	This general approach to minimising visual impacts was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and is further outlined within in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact within this DCO application **[REF: 6.1]**. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site, which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact.

5	**Visual Impact**	It is a very beautiful site, rural and rich in wildlife, which is a big draw for the people who have chosen to live here. I feel that a solar farm in this area would be taking away so much from nature/wildlife/humans. I think there are better places for solar. Waste land or commercial roofs - like Germany. We have much less land, land is scacred.		This general approach to minimising visual impacts was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact and is further outlined in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site, which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in the Landscape Chapter of the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has assessed the effects on Biodiversity within the Environmental Statement and quantified the potential biodiversity benefits within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In general, the Proposed Development will result in a net gain significantly in excess of 10%, which is the guidance provided by national planning policy. A key change to the land use will be a reduction in grazing from sheep. This will result in an improvement of species diversity, and the establishment of natural corridors improving the habitat for wildlife within the Site. While it is preferable to put solar panels on industrial or brown belt land, this is often earmarked for other developments such as industrial or housing. As a result, solar is often priced out of contention. Solar farms currently account for 0.08% of total land use in the UK [Solar Energy UK 2022]. The Government targets for a fivefold increase in solar would result in 0.3% of the UK land area being used by solar [Carbon Brief, 2022]. This is the equivalent to around half of the space used by golf courses.
6	**Socio-economic**	This is a major project which will adversely	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The discussion of the proposed

		affect a large area with two local parishes. It is essential that those living near the site see adequate benefits - in cash or kind - proportionate to that already provided by local wind farms		community benefits is ongoing and will continue outside of the formal DCO application. The Applicant has engaged with Dean and Distington Parish Councils Working Group in discussion over the community benefit proposals, to ensure these are appropriate for those most impacted by the Proposed Development.
7	**General**	No	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
8	**Site Location**	Strongly against the idea. Big fan of solar but wrong area. Come for a site visit and I will be happy to explain anything written. Think you should have visited all local sites/ homes first. Rude that this hasn't happened.	No	This general approach to minimising visual impacts was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and is further outlined in the within in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, further details of this can now be found in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]**, including a description of reasonable alternatives. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility to the strategic road network. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site, which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**. While it is preferable to put solar panels on industrial or brown belt land, this is often earmarked for other developments such as industrial or

				housing. As a result, solar is often priced out of contention. Solar farms currently account for 0.08% of total land use in the UK [Solar Energy UK 2022]. The Government targets for a fivefold increase in solar would result in 0.3% of the UK land area being used by solar [Carbon Brief, 2022]. This is the equivalent to around half of the space used by golf courses. The Applicant outreached to all households in the local area with invitations to the non-statutory and statutory public consultations [Appendix 2.10 and 5.6] to provide feedback on the Proposed Development. Household visits were offered to the nearest residential properties, with additional visits following the statutory consultation.
9	**Socio-economic**	Other - We have a community fund from the wind turbines. Not against solar, just the wrong site. How would you like it on your doorstep? We have had no site visits prior to this form.	No	This general approach to minimising visual impacts was outlined in the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and is further outlined in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]** within this DCO application. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact. Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, further details can be found ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]**, including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility.

				The Applicant outreached to all households in the local area with invitations to the non-statutory and statutory public consultations [Appendix 2.10 and 5.6] to provide feedback on the Proposed Development. Household visits were offered to the nearest residential properties, with additional visits following the statutory consultation.
10	**General**	N/A	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

17. How did you find out about our consultation?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
11 respondents ticked 'Received a letter / brochure'
1 respondent ticked 'Saw it advertised in the media'
1 respondent ticked 'Via a local community group'

18. Have you attended any of our consultation events?
Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
8 respondents ticked 'Yes'
6 respondents ticked 'No', with two specifying the following:
o 'due to family issues'
o 'have watched them back'

19. How informative did you find our consultation materials?

Of those who submitted an answer to this question, the following responses were received:
· 4 respondents ticked ‘Very informative’
· 7 respondents ticked ‘Quite informative’
· 2 respondents ticked ‘Not informative’
Where additional comments were provided, these have been faithfully reproduced below. Any identifying features of responses have been redacted. The category of response as above is outlined in bold where provided.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	Consultation	**Quite informative** - what was in the brochure was really on the boards, except for road cleaning. It was a good chance to speak with someone though.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.
2	Consultation	**Not informative** - they only favour the project not the community at all. Borderline based on false predictions.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The information provided on the PEIR provide a worst-case scenario for the Proposed Development. This is conducted to ensure effective mitigation to potential impacts. The Applicant has conducted a thorough consultation process with local residents and other local stakeholders regarding the proposals. Opportunity has been given for the community to feed back on the design and mitigation.
3	General	**Not informative** - only in favour of the project	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response.

Appendix 6.20 Additional responses received via email from section 47 consultees
Where additional consultation responses were provided alongside the feedback form, or where no feedback form was returned but consultees provided comments via email, these have been provided below.

Response ID	Theme	Comment	Design change	Applicant response
1	General	Good morning Having now had the opportunity to review the information that was circulated to local properties and take the time to properly respond, we can provide the feedback below. We do hope that this can be properly considered as part of the consultation process, despite the consultation period being 11 March to 26 April 2024. Having attended one of the consultation events at the end of March and given the scale of the proposal and proximity to our home, hopefully the timing of our response is reasonable. Whilst our comments focus on highlighting potential local issues and disbenefits associated with this proposal, we do appreciate the importance of the move towards Net Zero at a UK and global level.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has allowed that this feedback be recorded despite being received outside of the close of the consultation period.

	Consultation Materials	1. Misleading public information circulated · Whilst professional and providing a lot of useful content, we consider that the information circulated to homes is fundamentally misleading. · It does not provide comparison of this option for use of the land against what the landowner could have done under alternative uses, nor does it fully detail disbenefits and opportunity costs. · It includes misleading pictures, such as that on page 16, which shows a small development. This may unduly make many stakeholders feel comfortable with the proposal. The pictures should be of a similar scale development elsewhere, both set in its local environment and showing the scale – i.e. how big it is versus collections of buildings. · It is therefore misleading and not a balanced	No	While the Applicant takes note of concerns raised by the respondee, the Consultation Brochure was provided to outline details of the Proposed Development and any associated impacts as investigated within the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report [PEIR]. Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site. The Alternatives and Design Evolution are considered in ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]**. Images presented of solar arrays within the consultation materials are indicative only, and intended to show what a solar array will look like. It is not intended to replicate the Proposed Development. The Applicant is seeking to apply for a development consent order. The Application will be decided by the Secretary of State responsible for the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. The Secretary of State will make a decision based on the compliance with policy [which includes requirements around the assessment of environmental effects], but also with consideration of the consultation, which was undertaken, and the Applicant's approach to addressing issues raised during the consultation process.

		presentation of the proposal to the public for consideration [see below]. · It is understood that a decision has already been made to go ahead with this project. Is this therefore a true consultation? Could the development be rejected or amended based on findings from the consultation?		
	Visual Impact	2. Scale of development · The scale of development is huge and beyond what most stakeholders might imagine when thinking of a solar farm [being unlikely to have seen such a development in this country] unless they fully seek to visualise the scale per the proposed development map. Not everyone will have done this. This is our main concern in terms of siting such a huge scale commercial, industrial development within 1 mile of our home. · It will change the landscape and approach to the village for the rest of our lifetime and will impact on	No	It is acknowledged that this Project is of a significant scale, and at the time of the consultation it was the largest solar farm in Cumbria. Projects of greater than 50MW are classified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects [NSIP]. As of January 2025, there are 7 other utility scale solar farms which exceed 50MW and which are currently going within the application the process for development consent. There are 7 further projects which have consent. The Applicant has surveyed and assessed the impact on sensitive viewpoints. These viewpoints have been selected based on locations where the Proposed Development will be visible to nearby residents, road users or people using public rights of way. The Applicant is proposing landscape screening in order to minimise the visual impacts where possible. Further details of the assessment and mitigation is provided in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**. Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development and in the ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]**, including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site. The Site was chosen for a number of reasons, including

		house prices in the villages closest to the project: Branthwaite and Gilgarran. It impacts on the reason that we bought our home – the approach and lack of development within 2-3 miles – and our only asset, which we paid a high price for and have worked hard towards owning. A relatively small community fund does nothing to compensate this loss in house value, which appears to be well documented for large-scale solar farms. · Recognising the need for and importance of renewable energy, we are supportive of small-scale developments, sympathetically sited and, most importantly, use of existing industrial and residential landscapes as a priority – for example, existing residential and industrial roof tops, all new builds, brownfield developments, with limited small scale greenfield developments spread across multiple communities. · Can the scale of the development be reduced? i.e.		solar irradiation, topography, agricultural land classification, low number of nearby properties, landscape and ecological designations, and accessibility. The Applicant has undertaken a site selection process to identify suitable land close to the Point of Connection [the existing Overhead Lines running through the Site]. In addition, the layout of the Site has been informed by a consideration of the potential environmental effects. The Applicant only has the option of using the land currently under consideration due to its proximity to the Point of connection. There is no evidence to suggest solar panels impact house prices. It is noted that the Proposed Development is for a temporary period of 40 years, after which the land will be returned to its current uses. While it is preferable to put solar panels on industrial or brown belt land, this is often earmarked for other developments such as industrial or housing. As a result, solar is often priced out of contention. Solar farms currently account for 0.08% of total land use in the UK [Solar Energy UK 2022]. The Government targets for a fivefold increase in solar would result in 0.3% of the UK land area being used by solar [Carbon Brief, 2022]. This is the equivalent to around half of the space used by golf courses. With regards to the suitability of Cumbria as a location for a solar farm, Solar PV panels rely on light emittance, as such cloud cover has a limited impact on their usability. The temporary construction compound's maximum potential size are described within the ES Chapter 5 – Construction and Decommissioning Methodology and Phasing **[REF: 6.1]**. The areas where the Primary and Secondary Compounds could be sited within are defined by Works Area 4. The primary compounds would be located north of Rigg House Farm, and at the existing access to the Potato Pot Wind Farm off Branthwaite Road.

		multiple smaller developments in different locations, spreading the impact across communities rather than loading an NSIP on a single place [effectively 2 villages being most significantly impacted – Branthwaite and Gilgarran]. Branthwaite is likely to become known as 'that village where the massive solar farm is' rather than 'a little-known rural village near Dean'. · Is this the optimal siting for a huge solar farm of national importance given the level of cloud cover in Cumbria? · How large are the temporary construction compounds [x5]? How long will they be in place? · What is the history and impact on communities of other similar sized solar farms in the UK? What are the lessons learned? · How long is the development phase?		The application team's experience of developing solar farms and other development elsewhere has informed the application which is being prepared. In addition, the Applicant has had regard to other best practice from other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and planning applications. For example, in relation to the best practice measures which are necessary to reduce the potential impacts to soils and drainage during construction, which is an issue raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority. Such measures are proposed within the outline Soil Management Plan, for example. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 5.3 – outline Soil Management Plan **[REF: 6.3]**. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.

		How big will the BESS site be? Will it definitely be in the proposed location, not on Branthwaite road?		
	Biodiversity; Community benefits	3. Benefits analysis · There is no mention of disbenefits in the benefits presented on page 14. · Is the biodiversity net gain all on site or in the immediate vicinity? Is any offsetting planned? Does it include the supply chain indirect impact of the development – manufacture, transport, logistics, materials etc? · The sheep grazing benefit is overstated – stocking density cannot be 'maintained' on a solar farm.	No	The benefits of the Proposed Development will be described in further detail within the Planning Statement which is submitted with the application. The environmental effects of the Proposed Development [beneficial and adverse] are assessed in the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has assessed the effects on Biodiversity within the Environmental Statement and quantified the potential biodiversity benefits within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In general, the Proposed Development will result in a net gain significantly in excess of 10%, which is the guidance provided by national planning policy. No off-site offsetting is proposed. Chapter 4 of the PEIR, and the Environmental Statement considers the Alternatives and Design Evolution in accordance with National Policy. This is expanded upon in the ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]**. There is not a requirement to consider the Land Stewardship Scheme, or other

		However, it is debatable whether sheep grazing itself is a significant benefit to wider stakeholders and it has a negative impact on the environment. From a project and wider stakeholder perspective, the weight placed on this, and its inclusion, is potentially misleading the community to be unduly favourable towards the project. · New wildlife habitats are not linked to the proposal only – this could be done anyway by the landowner under other options, particularly given the new Environmental Land Stewardship Schemes about to come into force, which have not been reflected and presented to the public in a BAU case in the proposal – i.e. what would have happened anyway with the new land use financial incentives being introduced by UK Government? · What is the real opportunity cost of this development? What future options will be removed?		potential alternative land uses, as without any firm proposal to implement such arrangements, these could not be assessed as a 'reasonable alternatives'. The 'Do Nothing' Scenario the Applicant envisages is that continued intensive sheep grazing would occur. On alternatives, paragraph 4.3.9 of NPS EN-1 considers the relevance of alternatives to be a ‘matter of law’. Paragraph 4.3.15 further outlines the requirement for an ES to include information about the ‘reasonable alternatives’ studied and take into account environmental, social and economic effects as well as technical and commercial feasibility. Paragraph 4.3.22 of EN-1 goes on to state that, due to the ‘urgency of need for new energy infrastructure,’ the Secretary of State should be guided by principles when deciding what weight should be given to alternatives, which include the consideration of alternatives being ‘proportionate’, and alternatives should only be considered if they meet the objectives of the Proposed Development. The onward investment of any business rate receipts would be administered and directed at the discretion of Cumberland Council.

		· There is already a lot of support for low-income households with energy saving measures in the area – is this a true 'additional' benefit of the proposal? · Increase in business rates for the Council to invest locally – will this be ring-fenced and directed to the impacted community?		
	Biodiversity; Community benefits	4. Business case There is no comparison against a 'counterfactual' Business As Usual case [i.e. what would happen anyway without intervention] – what is the best alternative use of the site? There could be greater local benefits and biodiversity improvements from alternative uses. The presented case is therefore misleading as benefits could be gained through other options that might not have a big impact on the area by having to create and tolerate a huge solar farm [and any associated disbenefits] in order to release these benefits.	No	Chapter 4 of the PEIR outlined the Alternatives and Design Evolution of the Proposed Development, including a description of reasonable alternatives for the future conditions of the Site. This is expanded upon in the ES Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution **[REF: 6.1]**.

	Visual Impact	5. PEIR · Page 25 concludes that the impact on the landscape when the site is viewed from the WHS is expected to be minimal. What about the other way round? Many stakeholders view the WHS from afar and the solar panels will impact on the approach to our village from the coast. Currently it is a circa 2.5-mile drive which builds in rural, rolling pastureland and views of the mountains until you drop down into the village of Branthwaite. With the development in place, it will become an industrialised drive. · The land is currently non-industrial, green fields, which time and effort has been taken to fully restore from its historical use a long time ago. For the 16.5 years we have lived here, it has been green field area, and the fact that it had been fully restored from its former use gave us comfort that it would remain that way for the foreseeable future when we	No	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [LVIA] which is submitted within the PEIR, and the Environmental Statement assesses the impact on views. Further details can be found within in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**. This includes considering the impact on viewpoints on the Branthwaite Road, which includes views of the Lake District National Park, the assessment acknowledges that the Proposed Development will be prominent in views from this perspective, although the impact will be reduced through screening. The impact on viewpoints including on the edge of Branthwaite are also assessed in the LVIA. Due to intervening topography and vegetation the views from the village itself are limited. However, there are views of parts of the Site from the Branthwaite Road when travelling into Branthwaite from the west. The impact on this viewpoint is assessed within the LVIA.

		bought our home. Will the panels be seen from anywhere within Branthwaite village? Has this been ascertained?		
	Community benefits	6. Community fund · Whilst a positive contribution, a £500,000 investment over the lifetime of the solar farm is extremely small in comparison to the scale of the development. · It will also only benefit a few members of the community – for example, users of Dean School, Dean Village Hall, or Dean Church. Not all of us use, or have a connection with, those buildings. This funding is therefore imbalanced. The most impacted villages are those closest to the development, but the funding is all focused on Dean, which is a little further away. How will Branthwaite itself benefit from the development? What other community fund activities are planned? The investments noted to date	No	The community benefit fund is separate to the DCO application. However, the Applicant has now committed to a £1.2 million community benefit fund. The Applicant is open to further suggestions as to how this fund can be disbursed and to which organisations. It is not possible for the Applicant to offer solar panels to residential households. However, the Applicant is already working with local community grounds, including those with an ecology/ biodiversity focus to consider how environmental improvements off site could be delivered through this community benefit funding.

		are standard community investments – we need something really impactful that is of benefit to the WHOLE community if this development is to go ahead in some form. It is a development of national importance and significance, and the community investments should reflect this. They should also seek to address the real disbenefits and negative impacts caused – for example, house price impacts in the immediate villages, deterioration of 'rural' status of the immediate villages, 'support for community solar panels' [page 14] – why not include all members of the community [not just users of Dean School] and offer solar panels to residential houses in the immediate villages? How about improving biodiversity within Branthwaite and Gilgarran villages as part of the new habitats and biodiversity improvements, perhaps working with local school groups?		

	Travel and Access	7. Transport The volume of construction traffic on the road to Branthwaite not clear. It is again misleading as there is mention of the minimal traffic during operation, giving comfort to stakeholders, but not the scale of traffic during construction and the length of the construction phase. We do appreciate the challenges of running such a project and consultation, and hope that you are able to properly consider the above in your proposal. We are also happy to discuss any of the comments and points raised.	No	The impact on operational traffic is described within the Transport Statement which is Appended to the Environmental Statement in ES Appendix 2.5 – Transport Statement [**REF 6.3**] There would not be a permanent presence of staff on Site during operation. The Applicant has prepared a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] following consultation that described the restrictions that the Applicant is committed to in terms of reducing the impact of construction traffic upon residents. The routing and guidance outlined in the CTMP will be adhered to by all construction traffic during the construction period. Feedback from the community has been helpful to the Applicant in preparing the CTMP and understanding the local road network.
2	Biodiversity	I am emailing this as I cannot be sure whether my the hard copy I sent earlier today will get to the right address nor the post office. I have sent by guaranteed next day recorded delivery Please be aware that I am sending a copy this document and my representations with objection to the Planning Authority directly, as well as to Curlew Action, RSPB, and the	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their comments. Surveys have been completed and the effects on birds are considered within the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Biodiversity chapter within the PEIR and in ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**.Various species were identified within the surveys included Lapwing [which are also red listed], but not Curlew, although it is acknowledged the Site is recognised as a potential breeding area for Snipe and Curlew [this is identified in the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment]. In general, the SHRA concludes that the Proposed Development would have no significant effects on breeding and wintering bird populations during construction or operation. During operation, this is because any adverse effects for a reduction in habitat under solar arrays

		local Press. Curlews are a red listed species which are prevalent in the immediate are and on the site. They do breed on this land as well, and this is a historical and current fact. Comment will also be made on the detrimental effect on biodiversity of the existing wind turbines including mortality of raptors and barn owls, apart from acting as scarecrows to birds within 1 km circumference. This includes rare species such as lapwing, curlew and snipe. None of these are mentioned in the assessments and one can only conclude that any surveys have not been conducted properly or so hastily as to not be relevant, or conducted by persons not qualified properly they may suggest that but they wont be. I suggest you read the comment regarding legalities because if this project goes ahead you will most like find a legal action taken against it primarily on the grounds stated. This would most likely bankrupt the project but also individuals involved including		would be offset by the improvements to the watercourses, hedgerows and grassland, and due to a reduction in grazing from sheep. The establishment of a Community Benefit Fund is common practice for development of this nature. However, this is not something that the Secretary of State can take into consideration in deciding on the application, or Cumberland would take into consideration when responding to the application.

		the landowners. In a fraudulent indictment, action can be taken against individuals and removes any corporate liability. I suggest you take this seriously as these consequences probably have not been assessed by all parties concerned. This site is not appropriate for this technology nor is the location generally. There are little or no community benefits and suggest otherwise is fraudulent. Include in this attempts to bribe the community and the local authority by suggesting payments to the Community Fund. I am endeavouring to complete a feedback form online in direct copy of my hard copy to insure that my feedback is delivered on time.		

	General	Supporting Argument Opposing Dean Moor Solar Farm. I wouldn't object to the Dean Moor Solar Farm if it were not so ludicrous. Solar farms are not an appropriate technology for this region if at all in the UK. Solar energy only has an application for mitigating residential or business property and only when it is attached to existing building. I am not going to argue the food security issue here, although undoubtedly there is one. Partly because this is marginal farmland which indeed is subjected to excessive sheep grazing intensity. However, it isn't an appropriate technology because the area only averages 1,400 hours of sunlight per year if that. An average of 3.83 hours per day. Many days there is zero sunlight. So any prospect for a solar farm is dismal. Most particular, there is extremely little sunlight for six months of the year, and current battery technology is not sufficient to accommodate that duration.	No	Solar PV panels are not dependent on direct sunlight to harness energy from sun, they just require some level of daylight in order to generate electricity. The efficiency of solar panels is enabling developers to progress sites in locations which generally have lower levels of solar gain. The Proposed Development is entirely a commercial proposition and requires no government support or subsidy. The Applicant is satisfied that it will be able to export the necessary power to the local electricity network in sufficient quantities to make the Proposed Development a viable commercial proposition. Even in winter, solar panel technology is still effective; at one point in February 2022, solar was providing more than 20% of the UK's electricity. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. There is an urgent need to generate energy from new, affordable, and environmentally friendly sources, and solar power emerges as the most cost-effective and rapidly deployable among all energy sources. Currently, its cost is one-ninth that of gas and less than one-third of nuclear energy. Solar power is a core part of the Governments' Net Zero target, and it intends to more than triple solar power capacity by 2030. Achieving this objective requires the deployment of larger scale solar farms as well as on the rooftops of industrial and residential buildings.

		This technology is appropriate in countries where there is a hugely more significant amount of sunlight and where the sun's energy is stronger in the sense that it is not mired by haze and other climatic factors. Notable in countries in Southern Europe such as Spain, the Middle East and North Africa. Here the technical can vastly more cost effective and the ability to supply UK at low cost far more beneficial to UK power users and the climate. After all we import oil now so why not electricity. Added this is the factor of inefficiency, which means that any project like this has zero impact on climate change parameters or UK net zero, and indeed little contribution to the community beyond filling the landowner's bank account and partners with subsidized taxpayers money. And indeed the taxpayer's contribution via government promotion and subsidy would be better spent in alternatives. On a cost benefit analysis [my father initiated and chaired the		

		world's first environmental impact and cost/benefit survey - setting the mould for all subsequent surveys.] there are alternative land use for this land that provide far more effective benefit to both the community, the environment, and the climate at large. My real objections are the misleading and I would suggest, fraudulent statements made in the document. I will deal with these in order:		
	Location	1. 50MW site "enough to power 50,000 households" This is a vast exaggeration particularly given the circumstances of the location. The document text suggests that these are calculated on UK basis where in fact the location is vastly different than average UK. Notwithstanding, whether the site can carry the capacity of 50MW at any particular time [expert opinion suggests otherwise], a 50MW power output facility would only carry the load from 10,000 households "at best" given the "median" for the	No	The figure of 50,000 typical family homes per year is based upon average domestic electricity consumption per home [temperature corrected] as per Energy Consumption in the UK [published September 2021, Table C9 of ECUK: Consumption data tables]. The Applicant has a grid offer from Electricity North West to export 150MW to the local Distribution Network. The 50MW figure provided in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report is the threshold for the application to qualify as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.

		locality usage of 3,209 kw/h per household. This figure taken as an average is likely to be nearer the national average of 3,700 kw/h and therefore it would be safer to say that “at best” it might produce enough electricity for between 5,000 and 10,000 households. More likely a couple of thousand given the variability and sporadic sunlight, as well as the winter equation. To put it mildly what is the point of a facility that only works sporadically for less than six months of the year, hardly at all in the remaining six months, in winter when the angle of the sun is also a diminishing factor given the terrain which consists of 200 metre ridge to the south [the important direction for a solar farm particularly give the latitudinal situation of the Sun at 54 degrees North! The site sits in the lee of the Sun and in fact the drop is 100 metres in altitude to the majority of the site across undulating landscape which is not at all flat.		

		To put it succinctly, at best, a 5KW solar panel unit might at best serve the power consumption of an average local household. 50MW represents 10,000 of these units, but it is well known that such household solar panel units are only between 60% to 80% effective in the area. How the figure of 50,000 is arrived at [let alone the 50MW capacity] is a disturbing question as it is both wholly inaccurate but misleading, and sets the tone for the rest of the document. “At best” is the key term. It is unlikely that this site offers “at best” opportunity and therefore, particularly as it is North facing will always at low capacity in an area of very low sunlight availability. To give a comparison, Shotwick Park, is 75MW capacity solar park which states that it contributes to 18,500 households and 60% of the energy supply to a renewable paper making facility. It claims to mitigate 15,991 tonnes of carbon		

		emission from fossil fuel type power stations. It s built on flat land not a North facing undulating sloping hillside some 1 degree further south in latitude. The statement of capacity are both misleading and misrepresent the overall capacity of this site to deliver. As such they constitute a fraudulent misrepresentation.		
	Biodiversity	2. New Habitats For Wildlife This is again a misleading statement and one that is used commonly to suggest conformity with local ecology to provide a compatible prospect for the project within the environmental parameters of local planners. The notion is to present an argument that offsets negative impacts. On the whole these are always presented as minimising effects when in fact they are vastly damaging. Just to take the nearby wind turbines. These have had a negative impact on the wildlife in the area, partly because they act as giant scarecrows. The “biodiversity” to use a now	No	The Applicant has assessed the effects within the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]** and quantified the potential biodiversity benefits within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In general, the Proposed Development will result in a net gain significantly in excess of 10%, which is the guidance provided by national planning policy. A key change to the land use will be a reduction in grazing from sheep. This will result in an improvement of species diversity, and the establishment of natural corridors improving the habitat for wildlife within the Site. While it is acknowledged that the land underneath the solar arrays would be less suitable for nesting or foraging birds, the Project as a whole would improve habitats and species diversity within the Site as a whole, relative to the current land use, sheep farming. The Biodiversity Chapter within the Environmental Statement addresses this which can be found in ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**. Surveys have been completed and the effects on birds are considered within the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Biodiversity chapter within the PEIR and in ES Chapter 8 -

		overused term as bad as “sustainability” [a notion that rely preserves negative impact rather than engender positive ones.] I know this because I have observed it directly, as I walk my dogs in the vicinity. There is a “flighting pond” close by and this would normally contain varieties of duck, such as teal, mallard, or even rare pochard. Instead there are none. Quite often wild geese can be heard in the distance which visit to graze nearby, but none come within a kilometre of the turbines. A solar park would even further preclude such fauna. More importantly the site runs parallel to an “open access site” or “CRoW”. This land was donated for this purpose I think originally by the country estate I live on, and formed part of the land the family who own it along with Dean Moor. They were originally local investors in local mines and over period of three hundred years owned parcels of land all over the area. The CRoW which is site at the head of the		Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**. The habitat within and outside of the Site is considered within the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity. The CRoW access land is an access related designation, rather than a biodiversity designation. However, it is noted that the land to the south of the Site is also a County Wildlife Site, which itself is within the Order Limits. The Applicant is engaging with Cumbria Wildlife Trust over improvements to be made within the parts of the County Wildlife Site which are within the Order Limits [site boundary].

		Feekle catchment is rarely used and therefore has begun to preserve and regenerate the moorland habitat that existed before the excesses of local sheep farming practices over the past fifty years. It is the same natural habitat as the proposed site, the key to which lies in the name Dean Moor. This is not natural meadow or pasture, and to promote the site as such is again both unnatural and as disingenuous as to suggest that “new habitats” can be created on a site that will become the largest solar panel covered area in the UK. It is again deliberately misleading and to put it mildly immature. My point about the CRoW is that it contains a very good nesting, and resting site for snipe [both varieties, common and jack], which are on the Amber List. I have seen at least 100 snipe on just one part of the CRoW, just walking through it with my working gundogs dogs [during the prescribed period I might add]. Such snipe will access the Dean Moor site to feed. Similarly endangered Curlew		

		use the Dean Moor site for nesting, and this bird is on the European Red List. Consequently, I am informing a good friend at Curlew Action of this proposal so that they might contest it - along with the RSPB. It is bad enough that these increasingly rare birds are threatened not only by wind turbines in the vicinity disturbing the pattern of their life cycle and daily migrations, but now by 279.5 hectares of solar panels with all consequence of natural disturbance that cause. To suggest otherwise is simply an untruth. The simple fact is that this proposal is urbanising a natural rural environment. Previously this was disturbed by mining, but at least British Coal regenerated the area by planting event woodland regeneration which has only just begun the long process to maturity. That compensatory measure has now been abused by unnecessary wind turbines, and now regeneration even further set back by a proposed solar		

		park. The necessity for this technology is a problem for the urban environment and should not be foisted on the delicate complexity of the natural environment presented by our rural areas. The demands on these are excessive as it is. Quite frankly it is for the urban environment to sustain its own power solution. One obvious solution is to de-urbanise. To reduce excess population and therefore excess demand. Rather than increase it with immigration that has made London the third most densely populated city in the World after Mumbai and Manila. Our cities have become centres of futile unproductive self-sustaining waste at every economic level. Self-indulgent as well. The fact is that the rural community sustains that waste of space [feeds it]. Yet it is increasingly being encroached on by the demands of polluting energy wasteful urbanised environments. What is more both modern appropriate wind turbine and solar technologies		

		could be applied across the urban area far more effectively by not damaging the rural or marine environment any further. “Don’t bite the hand that feeds” is the age old adage. To say that sheep may safely graze amongst a pasture covered in solar panels is risible as is the notion that intense chemicals have been used in the farming practices. It has also become prevalent to rely on supposed scientific evidence. But most of this unqualified [poor education from dismal low quality university degrees filled with doctrinal dogma] and “bought”. In this sense you get any opinion you, the proposers, pay for. To give an example the Robin Rigg Wind Farm in the Solway in Scotland was built just a few miles from Europes most important wildfowl reserve. It beggars belief that any decent or informed scientist could sign off on the environmental impact. But they did. Both for money and through utter ignorance. Notwithstanding		

		that failure they also failed to examine the impact of the turbines on local seabed and therefore important fisheries in the Solway. The result is that already the sands have shifted extensively. Enough to completely disturb the shrimp ecology and reduce the remaining shrimping boat [out of 36] to fishing for only for a few months in the summer, when it used to be out between ten to twelve months. The extent of the effect on the Solway marine biomass apart from the completely neglectful pollution by United Utilities imbecility in the rivers, has yet to be examined properly. This has to be weighed up as evidence of falsities or economy of truth in assessment of of any environmental proposal, and that it is no longer sufficient just to whitewash a proposal's EIA with insufficient ill judged unqualified assessment. Particularly when that is followed up with misleading statements. To this extent the fact that the document incorrectly assess the		

		vegetation or rather the natural vegetation [example in the CRoW and again in point to the word Moor in the name of the place]] one cannot except that 279,5 hectares of solar panels is going to lead to a 10% increase in biodiversity. And I say that as both a casual observer and someone with a great deal of expertise. An example would be the number of roe deer that inhabit the terrain and the woodland area near the wind turbines. These are used to feeding on pasture made available by the sheep. No one in their right mind could argue that reducing that pasture by 90% is going to improve their lot. Nor will increased human activity from planned access paths on the site as per pro other wildlife. It is just a hugely implausible even absurd argument. The same notion goes for flora as the solar panels will be directly removing sunlight from terra firms - extensively over the area.		
	Flood risk, hydrology, and drainage	3. “No Risk From Flooding” The document claims that	No	The Applicant has prepared a Flood Risk Assessment [‘FRA’] and outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy [‘oSWDS’] to consider the risks from flooding and describe the arrangements to manage

		there is little risk from flooding and that any risk will be mitigated by vegetation. ? This is just nonsense. Any hydrologist [admittedly there are previous few with any real qualification these days] will give you an idea of the amount of precipitation of the particular site [amongst the highest in the country] relative to hardened impervious surface. The exact surface and technical details of the solar farm are not published. In order to produce 50MW capacity a significant portion of 279.5 hectares will have to be covered .... let's say two thirds for good measure although the capacity could never reach full potential in that case [ie 50MW]. Let's put it another way. What do you imagine the runoff from 76 miles of a major A road highway receiving 45 inches plus of rainfall per year. I maintain a weather station nearby. Because that is the equivalent area we are talking. Surface runoff is a particular problem of road surfaces. Why should a solar panel be any different? And		surface water runoff. In general, the Proposed Development avoids areas of impermeable surfacing which would reduce infiltration and contribute to increased flood risk. Further details of this can be found in ES Appendix 2.4 – Flood Risk Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.

		then the problem with this is that because the site is sloped and undulating this runoff is channelled, causing erosion, and rapid. Therefore its contribution to flood risks in the already risky Derwent and Marron catchment is significant. On the Derwent because it back up from the sea, but more likely the Marron all the way down from Branthwaite and even upstream from there. The point is that surface penetration is greatly reduced and ground saturation too. Draining the facility will simply increase that runoff, and infiltration pits or drainage field resting soakaways would have to be substantial with knock effects to changes made to the soil geology, and yet because of the 100 metre drop off the water most likely only increase the marshy area close to the wind turbines with its pond possibly undermining the turbines, and then drain off the extensive drainage channels there into the catchment system or into the woodland near there which has little effect mitigation		

		effect during winter. I would suggest that mitigating the site from surface runoff will prove difficult and that much of the flood risks will accumulate in the Potato Pot Wind Farm vicinity, before entering the Marron system. Then any artificial soakaways cannot be implemented on much of the site, given that the open cast structure of the land is still unstable. There were and still issues with methane release from the wind turbines which are badly located but situated in the marshy bog at the Potato Pot site, and which will accumulate all the runoff [quite a considerable volume of water] from the southern part of the badly proposed project. This factor is sufficient to warrant any planning application to be refused. Failure to do so will bring the planning authority not only into disrepute but in direct negligence of both public safety but safety of the site at large apart from any person working on site at any time or travelling on the public		

		highway in close proximity. With regard to this I am contacting a senior official at the county Fire Brigade, known to me personally, to make arrangement for a Fire Brigade assessment of possible flood and fire hazards on the site. Particularly with regard to hazardous battery equipment in close proximity to a site that already carries site warning signs with regard to the methane. There are no mitigations that can be effected for this, and the planners should be made aware that according to one witness living nearby a man employed on the wind turbine construction very nearly died from methane poisoning. On the Eastern edge of the Southern site, the cut at Thief Gill demonstrates the volume of water and erosional factors on this land. Runoff from the Eastern half is likely to populate this stream and then carry on through to Branthwaite Edge. To put that into quantity imagine the greater portion of one		

		thousand milk trucks [8,000 gallons each] emptying into an inflated any way Thief Gill and then on into an inflated already River Marron let's say over a 24 hour period [but it could be twelve hours]. This is estimated on six inches of rain over a twelve/twenty four hour period. I have experience that volume of rainfall at least three times in the past five years in this locality. All this caused by runoff from the hardened surfaces of the solar panels. To angle these would exacerbate the runoff as much of the rain in the area is driven by high winds.		
	Visual Impact	4. "The Visual Impact Will Be Mitigated" The document purports that "glint and glare" will be removed from the site lines of the surrounding area. The details of how are not made exactly clear. It is presumed from one comment that this includes tree cover. Quite how this can be implemented within the forty year lifespan is also not explained. It is suspected that substantial	No	The Glint and Glare Assessment which was provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during the statutory consultation has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within the Landscape Strategy Plan, ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. This considers the impact on dwellings and road users, which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity. The general approach to minimising visual impacts was outlined in

		levee might be planned but not explained, and these works would represent an additional feature for planning oversight. Objection could well be raised with regard to these separately. To give an idea. I have attached a photograph in which the elevated sections of the Lake District National Park. This shows clearly the line of sight from the proposed Dean Moor Solar Farm. In the distance one can see the prominent feature of Knock Murton and Murton Fell. Next to it the higher ground on Blake Fell. One can also see a thicket of 40 year old conifers on the site in the frame of the picture which demonstrates that this could not possibly prevent this huge solar farm being visible from the elevated lands in the Park. To qualify that the Lake District National Park attracts visitors who hike in these hills from across the World. More importantly in July 2017 the National Park became a World Heritage Site on the same footing as the Pyramids		the PEIR in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact, and within the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.1]**, within this DCO application. This includes a consideration of views from the Lake District National Park and nearby residential receptors. Mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development will be achieved through a combination of landscape screening and by siting larger buildings in equipment in locations which are naturally screened by the landscape. For example, the substation is proposed to be situated in an area of the Site which is at a lower level, and is less visible to nearby dwellings or from long distance views. Further details of this are provided in the within in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact.

		and the Taj Mahal. Much of the winning features of the award relate to the visual experience not only within the Park but from it was well. This was aided by the huge amount of photographs submitted including some of my own. Of course we can't rely on the current CEO of the Lake District National Park Authority who has always shown an excessive of irresponsible toward even the first article of the National Parks Act, and his comment on the Windermere pollution at the time, the excessive logging in the Park and many other misdemeanour will be facing legal prosecution of himself and his tenure shortlived thereafter. But this does not mean that the legislation behind the Park and its obligations as a World Heritage Site should not be properly observed. On a clear day and in sun, this solar farm will be clearly visible. In a further point in my submission I will outline the British laws which protect those interest but also preclude a defence of the site being of service to the		

		state and public with regard to climate change or necessity. The proposed solar farm will also be in the line of sight of nearby farmsteads and particularly its closest neighbours, the Fishers, whose rights in this matter so far have been clearly neglected. This notwithstanding the likelihood of a perimeter fence around the whole property a] to prevent deer entering and damaging panels and also people. This has not even been mentioned but nonetheless reduces the whole question of increased public access on the site and unsubstantiated rights of way. Along the raised Southern perimeter is a bye-road or Pica Road. This is a popular route for cyclists even an alternative to the official C2C route and also attracts hikers. It also carries a fair amount of traffic as it is a shortcut from the arterial A5086 from Cockermouth to Whitehaven. The extensive proposed solar farm will be in clear view from		

		this road. The view from this road just above site is a one of the best views across the entire Solway to Dumfriesshire and across the Solway Plain. Even it is now blighted by all the wind turbines both close by and around Workington. A high density solar farm within this landscape would intolerable. Might we remind the planning authority that the West Cumbria/Lake District tourist industry and the amenities of the region which centres on the landscape primarily. It is an important factor of the local economy and needs to be progressed not downgraded.		
	Community benefits	5. “Benefits To The Community” Pages 14 & 15 are a litany of falseties. This project will not generate any on going employment of local jobs in any significant extent. In fact on the contrary it will take agricultural contractors off the land. To promote that idea is fraudulent. The donation of a paltry £500,000 to the Community Fund has to be	No	The community benefit fund is being discussed outside the DCO application; however the Applicant has now committed to a £1.2 million community benefit fund. The Applicant is open to further suggestions as to how this fund can be disbursed and to which organisations. It is not possible for the Applicant to offer solar panels to residential households. There is no government subsidy or sponsorship of this proposal. Cumberland Council have been consulted on the proposals and have made their own commitments to Net Zero. The Applicant has assessed the effects on Biodiversity within the Environmental Statement ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**

		considered as bribery. Big then the level of corruption in these government sponsored schemes is a disgrace, using climate change to drive motives of self interest and profit rather than properly assessed cost benefit. We live in an economy of fraud and scam at every level from large corporations, energy companies,, to internet fraud as even all levels of government. It pervades in climate change where a whole segment of society are being driven by false concepts, bad science and inaccuracy. I don't mean that climate change is not happening only that the means to try and restore balance is being perverted by the whole apparatus that has emerged as "climate change remedies".. The public need and demand better. The project wil not "assist local homes with energy saving devices" or certainly there is evidence of why? It is there supposedly to generate electricity. It does not propose to share that generation with		and quantified the potential biodiversity benefits within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. In general, the Proposed Development will result in a net gain significantly in excess of 10%, which is the guidance provided by national planning policy. A key change to the land use will be a reduction in grazing from sheep. This will result in an improvement of species diversity, and the establishment of natural corridors improving the habitat for wildlife within the Site. The Applicant is not proposing to remove any mature trees or hedgerows to enable development. As a general principle where existing trees are present the Applicant is committed to retain these for screening purposes, or to enhance the connectivity between habitat on Site and off site.

		the community. So no local benefit derived there. It states that it is helping “the County Council achieve its Net Zero goals.” but in reality this as I have stated earlier is deliberately exaggerated and involves inappropriate technology being applied to the area. Besides which, the Council will too busy working out the effects on “Net Zero” of several thousands of hectares of conifer and other woodland have been prematurely felled by inappropriate forestry management of the past decade. This when they and the forestry managers are brought to account as much of it concerns national assets. These pages imply that wildlife will benefit. There is a natural deficit and the habitat is being appropriated by a technology and building development that is entirely alien to it. To suggest otherwise is fraudulent. Notions such as “wild flower meadows” and flourishing hedgerows are pathetic. As I have already mentioned the		

		natural environment here is moorland including mostly heather [not grassland and sphagnum bog,] the remnants of which can be found nearby. There is no such thing as “native trees” in this country. This is a concept designed to alienate conifers and other species such as beech. But in fact there are fossil remains of conifers dotted around the entire region from several million years earlier. Species such as oak, juniper and hazelnut and more were introduced here by man after the ice age partly because their seeds are natural portage food for migrating hunter gatherers, but also it would take over half a million years for such species to colonise naturally from the nearest point in Southern Spain for the expanse of the retreating ice. The only alternative to the current grazing would be to restore this land to its natural moorland status or be put to woodland. The latter would on an area this size would extract over 500,000 tonnes of carbon over the next 80 years		

		even as relatively less dense plantation. For the following 80 years after that it would yield between 8 to 10 times that yield until it matures at 160 years [the actual maturity age of a conifer or hardwood]. It would also carry on doing that for several centuries if properly managed These are the facts that are ignored in the management of woodland at present. Mature trees are the most efficient engineering for positive reversal of climate change at present. To be knocking them down to be burned or turned into cardboard in Workington is a travesty. But to suggest that an inefficient solar park would be better suited for this land than woodland or “rewilding” is fundamentally incorrect. It should be pointed out that some of the grazing on the site is better than being made out in their surveys, partly from the efforts of applying artificial methods of restoration. The chemical that would have been applied		

		would be “liming” which is more natural. However applications of manure which will have been used, are damaging to the watercourses.		
	Location	6. Alternatives. In any project there are opportunity costs. These are the benefits that might be derived from alternative uses over and above those proposed. As I have stated the real benefits of producing electricity on this site are so insignificant partly because the site is not suitable for solar power. Solar power farms need flat land but they also need to be in areas where there is sufficient sun. This is particularly the case here where agricultural sheep production has relatively high yield. Which it does and the food security is certainly preferable to urbanising this land for solar use. But given the insignificant capacities and efficiencies involved from a climate change point of view, woodland and moorland regeneration would yield better results from any solar	No	As noted above solar PV panels do not require direct sunlight, nor do they require flat land as panels can be angled appropriately to catch the sun. As noted above, this Application receives no government or council sponsorship or subsidy.

		application. The government are offering subsidies to do that and still keep farming practices. Just improve them. The landowner would be better served and the community better served by that recourse. In this region there are some 10,000 skilled Nuclear workers. There is an existing nuclear site. The application of government sponsored CO2 emission reductions energy supply and that of the local council should be directed at providing modern British driven [rather than imported] nuclear technology [particularly those being developed by Rolls Royce] The provision of a more sustainable and continuous rather than fluctuating power source, would sustain employment on a large scale in the region. The County Council should e directing there attention to that rather than supporting spurious ineffective “green” technologies such as this solar farm proposal.		

	Location; Visual Impact; Biodiversity	7. Aspects Of Law The famous case of London Brick Company whose plant in Bedfordshire was successfully prosecuted for pollution should be seen as one precedent for forethought in this matter as well as that of other 19th century environmental cases. These cases set the precedence for environmental law even now. Walter vs Selfe 1851 sets out the principles of public nuisance and particularly where that transports itself across boundaries. The Attorney General vs The Borough of Birmingham 1858 furthers the argument where defences of prescriptive rights or arcing the greater public good are also negated. This latter also clarifies why United Utilities should be prosecuted for the continuing pollution of the county's rivers and then trying to cover over that offense. In this case there are more than justifiable cause of risks transferring beyond the boundaries. Glint and glare pollution being one. This extends some four to five	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their comments. In terms of the consideration of the potential for nuisance effects within this application, a Statutory Nuisance Statement has been prepared and will be submitted with the Application. In terms of the consideration of pollution to watercourses, or the ground, the mitigation in place to avoid such effects is described within the Construction Environmental Management Plan. ES Appendix 5.1 – Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan ['CEMP'] [**REF: 6.3**]

		miles to a World Heritage Site. Excess surface runoff risks have been explained by me succinctly as a question of excessive surface area, and with consequences effecting way beyond the boundaries. Mr. Fisher who lives with 180 metres of the proposed site has issues of noise with the wind farm [which should be address] and potential nuisance issues concerning the proposed solar farm - particularly the hazards presented by inverters and batteries being proposed to be built near Togo's dwelling, apart from the unsightly engineering effecting his and his families peaceful enjoyment of their property and the vicinity as a rural country landscape. They did not expect the adjacent land to become urbanised. Nor did any of the local neighbouring properties and the community who are extensively opposed to this development should not be ignored. The County Council planners should start to take notice of public opinion, and with reference I am putting them on notice		

		about the recent housing development at Lamplugh which was opposed by public opinion by 80% majority vote and has foisted on the community an excessively dense inappropriate property development without justifiable cause. Other than it has lined the pockets of an individual developer. There may arise legal action concerning that as elements of it breach law. Just as in this case if it progresses legal action will be taken primarily on the basis of the frauds outlined but also the local authority and government's actions in perpetuating those frauds. A secondary issue will concern the protection of endangered species, notably the curlew and to an extent common snipe.		

		8. Summary ~ the site is unsuitable for solar farm and is unlikely to reach any of its stated objectives. ~ the site is particularly unsuitable for a solar farm of this size and intensity and would better placed if resources located it in a more suitable location ~ the opportunity costs of the proposal give rise to the increased advantages of alternative use for the land including retaining its cattle raising capacity or putting this to woodland or moorland regeneration or a combination of all these, for which there are government subsidies available. ~ the documentation contains many deliberately misleading and fraudulent statements. It is likely these will be perpetuated through the process and any enforcement of it by an authority will only serve to perpetuate those illegalities and land abuses.	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their comments. The Applicant has responded to the points raised individually within this document.

		~ there is local opposition to this proposal and local residents should not be bullied or bribed in the process There so many other factors I could further argue with this incredibly inappropriate proposal but haven't sufficient time. Suffice it to say that this project should NOT go any further and should never be granted permission. Any appeal to the Secretary of State will carry the same objection only supported by action groups and hard evidence, and the legalities of the fraudulent statement pointed out.		

	General	——— Just to address my qualification for making these comments. [redacted]r, [redacted]M[redacted]dge], DPhil [Oxford] was a senior civil servant [FCO], environmentalist and notable academic [Cambridge]. In 1954 he initiated and chaired the world's first comprehensive environmental impact study, Jonglei Canal Project, whilst serving as a senior government official in East Africa. He later became Minister of Agriculture & Fisheries for the British Government in East Africa, and then Director [with ambassador status] of the Middle East Development Division which later became the Ministry of Overseas Development. The initial development of both Dubai and Kuwait City can be attributed to his department Much of it using British engineering expertise. In later life he became a senior head	No	The Applicant thanks this respondent for their comment.

		of faculty and senate at Cambridge University. In 1982 he organised a conference at the Royal Geographical Society on the Nile in which the ministerial representatives of seven African nations through which the Bild flows attended. I derive much of my knowledge and experience of environmental impact studies from him but his considerable team whom I grew up with which included his chief forester, his chief engineer and hydrologist. Apart from all the ecologists that also were involved in his later work concerning Africa. Other influences my fathers friends and cousins, such as, Lord Buxton, who not only founded Anglia TV, but also the Survival programmes. You could say I have had a thorough grounding in environmental issues from a realist and scientifically accurate perspective. I have degree in Geography from Lancaster University which included studies of this region, of environment and also fluvial hydrology. I also		

		undertook post graduate research at the Station Biologique de Le Tour du Valat, with particular research on land use in National Parc. The Camergue is a Parc Regional. Also in comparative analysis to our own Lake District and Broadland area in the UK. I then became a senior investment analyst in the City with thorough knowledge of statistics and scientific process. I have been directly involved with conservation and environmental issues particularly with regard to salmon conservation. I have been a salmon fishery manager and owner [River Tweed] and these days have started to direct my attention to woodland management and local conservation issues. I am fully conversant of all the nonsense end fallacies spoken in the name of science with regard to the environment, and climate change. I am not a non-believer in climate change or solar power for that matter. I only that any technology		

		should be applied in appropriate locations for appropriate reasons. I do not believe self interest and profit to be a primary factor in that process. Particularly where there is no benefit derived either to the land, nature or the wider community at large. I currently live about tw[redacted]ect on the[redacted] The addressee should note that these comments have been prepared for the planning authorities and is being sent to them as a formal objection and recommendation for them to refuse the application.		
3		Dear Sir/Madam, Firstly I would like[redacted] [redacted]or over [redacted]nly residential property to be dramatically effected by this	No	Noise impact assessments have been undertaken in order to minimise impact upon residents. ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.

		proposed [redacted] s also o partner [redacted] as lived all his life [redacted] years and our daughter [redacted] has lived here all her life [redacted] years. We have lived in a happy quiet environment in the countryside, [See video of the sounds we hear on a normal day this is taken on our boundary fence to the proposed solar farm. However what you Dean Moor Solar Farm are proposing will change our lives for ever. The thought of where you have proposed to put the 3 metre solar panels is about 5 metres from our boundary fence, this has and will continue to affect my mental health, I'm so stressed I cannot sleep, I have been to the doctors as I am a nervous wreck and feeling depression coming on, all this because you want to put the solar panels so close to our home, when you have 700 plus acres to position them, if there was a housing estate or village where we are I feel you would have the		In response to the resident's concerns, the draft Parameter Plan and Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]** were shared with the resident during a meeting on the 30th of January 2025, ahead of the application submission. These detail the potential location of solar arrays, the proposed set back which has been included between the property and solar infrastructure, and landscape screening. The resident explained that they remain concerned about the visual impact, particularly from solar arrays located on the land to the west of the dwelling, despite the inclusion of the set back of solar arrays to the north. A visualisation from the perspective of the boundary of the property in question may be found in the Landscape and Visual Chapter (ES Ch 7) **[REF: 6.2]**. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed landscape screening and set back in limiting the visibility of the solar arrays. This information was not available at the time of the meeting with the resident on 30th January 2025, and will help the resident understand how targeted planting and siting of solar infrastructure to respond to topography will minimise the visibility of solar arrays.

		panels much much further away as the village would be protesting so much. I have enclosed photos of our view now we see green fields and sea across the Solway. Another concern is the devaluation of our home and business as who would want to look at these HUGE Solar Panels , who will compensate us ? You ? The first proposed position of the panels was further away from our boundary fence again I have enclosed a drawing, however since then you have moved them dramatically forward towards our fence, we have had site meetings with [redacted] and his team and expressed that we need the solar panels away from our property , he brought the latest proposal with the drawings of a mocked up idea of how it would look it was Horrific [I cried when your team showed it to me]again ive attached a photo, the land drops naturally away from our fence, so if you moved it 350metres away it would have less impact on us.		

		told myself at since putting in for planning permission the efficiency of Solar panels has improved so they will not need to use as much land as they first thought, so again please can you move the solar panels 350 metres away from our boundary fence ? Other predicted problems		
	Noise	Noise Our background sounds are birds singing, During the construction of the site which is proposed to take 2 to 3 years of 200 workers working 24 hours per day, during that time we will hear construction sounds people, vehicle, machines tools etc, when it is built we will hear whistling through the frame work of the panels , if you are not aware the site is very high up and a very very very windy area of West Cumbria. The humming of the fans and heating ventilation and air conditioning, as you admit to on page 31 of your latest brochure, again we are the only residential property to be	No	Noise impact assessments have been undertaken in order to minimise impact upon residents. ES Appendix 2.6 – Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.

		affected, so please listen to our concerns.		
	Visual Impact	Vision & Glint & Glare At the moment from our boundary fence we look across green fields to the Solway and Sea, we have picnic tables overlooking these fields, we enjoy entertaining friends with BBQ and customers sit there enjoying the view whilst waiting to collect there cars or wait for a MOT. The proposed positioning of the panels all we will see is 9 metre high black mass of units, plus the way you will position them for the sun, they will point directly onto our yard and garage, so we will suffer from glint and glare, you have confirmed we will be affected on your latest leaflet on page 29. The road running along confirmed we will be affected on your latest leaflet on page 29. The road running along side the field could suffer from glint and glare and potentially cause accidents.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the Landscaping Chapter of the Environmental Statement. The Glint and Glare Assessment, further details of which can be found in ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment, was also provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report during the statutory consultation has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within the Landscape Strategy Plan, ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan . This considers the impact on dwellings and road users, which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity.

	Safety	Safety & Health Risk We are concerned where the battery storage will be positioned, as lithium batteries can catch fire [look at all the electric cars catching fire], such fire are subject to thermal runaway, and can be accelerated by electrical discharge and generate considerable heat and toxic fumes. Also the potential health risk from solar panels themselves, I have asked the question to [redacted] and team and no one can confirm 100% there is no health risk associated with these panels and the closer to our home the greater the risk.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
	CTMP	Construction The concern here is you have changed the proposed site access points, it was always access points 1,2,3 and 4. Now you have added 5,6 and 7, see attached photo or page 11 on your latest booklet . 6 and 7 are dangerous pull outs for vision and if the construction traffic is coming in and out of there the problem is that the road drops	No	The Applicant has prepared a Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] following consultation that includes measures to minimise the impact of construction upon residents. The routing and guidance outlined in the CTMP will be adhered to by all visitors to site during the construction period. Feedback from the community has been helpful to the Applicant in preparing the CTMP and understanding the local road network.

		down and if vehicles are pulling out of them the traffic on the road will be on top of them as they will not see them them pulling out and I predict regular accidents, i'm sure the police would object . The other thing is it will make our yard really noisy with the wagons people etc.		
	Biodiversity	Wildlife The land you are using has a large amount of deer, I think you should rethink the fencing as the dear will not be able to jump in and out as they have done for 100s of years.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the Biodiversity Chapter of the ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity **[REF: 6.1]**.
4	General	Please find attached my personal feedback on your consultation. It is not clear to me whether you will be able to read the text in the boxes I have written. When I view the .pdf file I can only see a few words. I have reproduced the text I have typed [with spelling mistakes corrected !] below, with the numbers indicating the section. Thank you [redacted]	No	
	Visual Impact; Biodiversity	4. I await more detail on key issues such as screening, public access, what is to be	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the

		done to increase biodiversity on the site, and in particular the impact of the BESS		Applicant took the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals. The Applicant is proposing new permissive paths through the Site. This is incumbent upon the DCO being approved, as such the Applicant cannot make any further commitments at this time. The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveys and will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. Further details of this are provided in the Landscape Chapter of the Environmental Statement. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant took the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
	BESS	5. There is very little information about the BESS. It feels like only a partial picture is being presented at the moment. The layout aspects of footpaths and biodiversity improvements are not yet clear.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
	Archaeology	6. The NTS states "A permanent Major Adverse effect is anticipated for the potential below ground heritage receptors [archaeological remains] prior to mitigation". This cannot be	No	The Applicant would be committed to undertaking trial trenching to assess the presence of any archaeological remains in those areas where the previously undertaken geophysical surveys of the Site indicate there may be some potential. This would be undertaken prior to construction. Any potential archaeological finds will be documented as outlined in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy.

		acceptable without some effort to assess [e.g. sample geophysical surveys] what underground features may be present.		
	Visual Impact	7. Early comments in the PIER look encouraging, but the detail is not yet clear. The images provided at the open day consultation events seem to show that more screening on the Lillyhall to Branthwaite road will be required. The development will have a major visual impact on the landscape which will be clearest from this road and more should be done to screen it with hedges and shrubs/low trees. Little detail on the fencing is provided - but it would be best if this could be placed behind a hedgeline in order to avoid the impression of an industrial site. The visual impact of the BESS is not at all clear.	No	The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveys and will implement screening in order to minimise the visual impact on residents. Further details of this are provided within in the ES Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Impact **[REF: 6.2]**.
	Biodiversity	8. The details of what is to be done are not yet available. My initial impression is that there is a lack of ambition and more could be done to enhance biodiversity without a major impact on the scheme. Corridors of tree planting to	No	

		link existing mature woodland around the edge of the development site would be a major improvement for wildlife [and should be co-located with public access routes if a all possible]. New water features could be created. I am concerned that the proposal is for the site to revert to its existing state after decommissioning, which would imply that all biodiversity gains would be lost - this would not be acceptable.		
	BESS	14. As mentioned above, the lack of information on the BESS is a concern. As a lay person looking at the documents, the fact that the PEIR is based on a "worst case" makes assessment difficult.	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.
	General	15. Community wellbeing and resilience, including adaptation to the impact of climate change	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Community Benefits	16. The engagement to date has been helpful. The Community Benefit Fund should be locally focussed to ensure the benefits reach the communities most directly impacted - in the parishes of	No	The Applicant has noted the comment and thanks the respondent for their response. The discussion of the proposed community benefits is ongoing and will continue outside of the formal DCO application. The Applicant has engaged with Dean and Distington Parish Councils Working Group in discussion over the community benefit

		Dean and of Distington. This would also allow projects funded by the CBF to be clearly associated with the Dean Moor Solar Farm in the public mind. The balance of funding between different "causes" should not be fixed - it would be better to work with the local communities to develop an agreed and shared plan for investment, and to allow the proportions to be allocated to the appropriate causes to emerge as a result. I think education would only be a worthy cause in this context if it related to increasing the awareness of climate change, the need to combat it, and the need to increase resilience amongst communities and nature/wildlife to cope with the effects. Early financial support for professional input to allow a shared plan to be developed and for project proposals to be scoped out would be very helpful.		proposals, to ensure these are appropriate for those most impacted by the Proposed Development.

5	General	The Project Team, I would like to let you know my concerns regarding the proposed Dean Moor Solar Farm. As I said last time we met I have lived at this address all my life 56 years looking after and enhancing our land and property over those years. The proposed solar farm is greatly going to affect our lives here as our property is the only property in direct contact to the proposed site . If the plan goes ahead we will be affected by the glint and glare as the solar panels will face our property and the massive visual impact it will have on us.	No	A Glint and Glare Assessment has been prepared and submitted with the Application, ES Appendix 7.9 – Glint and Glare Assessment **[REF: 6.3]**, this has been updated to take into account of the proposed landscape screening which is committed to within the Landscape Strategy Plan. This considers the impacts from key receptor locations [i.e. dwellings], which varies depended on the angle of the arrays and the sun. The assessment concludes that the effects from Glint and Glare are not significant and can be mitigated. For context, solar panel technology has significantly improved in terms of the reflectivity of the panels. Reflectivity is undesirable as it represents light which has not been trapped and converted to electricity. The Applicant has undertaken extensive surveying and implemented both mitigation and biodiversity net gain strategies which can be viewed in the Landscape Chapter of the Environmental Statement **[REF: 6.1]**. This will include screening around the site to prevent impact on local views, as well as views from the Lake District National Park, who have provided comments during the consultation. These may be found, along with the Applicant's response above. Representative viewpoints from within the National Park have been assessed within the Environmental Impact Assessment, and visualisations which provide an interpretation of how the Proposed Development might look from those viewpoints are also provided.
	Visual Impact	1. One of my main concern is the distance of the boundary & solar panels from our property , to close and will have a major impact on our property. We currently have a customer and our private outside waiting and pick nick area looking over the green fields towards the Solway	No	The Applicant met with the resident during the Statutory Consultation to discuss the Proposed Development. The Applicant explained the mitigation which was proposed within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report [PEIR] publicised during the Statutory Consultation. Following the statutory consultation the Applicant has increased the set back between the potential location of the closest solar arrays and the curtilage of the property in question to make use of the natural screening provided by topography.

		Coast and Scotland I don't want to loose this view, this will be lost if you go ahead with your current proposal. This won't be a problem if the solar farm boundary in the field next to our property is moved much further back as the contour of the land starts to drop away at 320 meters from our boundary. Even with your proposed hedgerows and tree landscaping unless your site boundary is moved back our view will be blocked. As you said at our last meeting you shouldn't need all the proposed land as the solar panels are much more efficient now.		The meeting included a discussion regarding the resident's proposal that the solar arrays be moved further from the property, to minimise impact on long distance views from the curtilage of the property. The Applicant explained to the resident that the area which was identified for solar within the PEIR at the Statutory Consultation was a 'worst case' for the purpose of exploring potential effects within environmental assessment, and that further changes would be considered for inclusion within the subsequent application. As was discussed with the resident on Site, the potential location where solar arrays may be located has been moved further north, to be situated beyond the crest of the hill and contour to the north of the property in question. Views of the solar arrays in this location would be screened partially or fully by the topography. This change is formalised within the proposed Landscape Strategy Plan and Works Area Plans which are submitted for development consent. ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. The combination of the natural screening provided by locating the solar arrays beyond the crest of the hill, and proposed hedgerows, this will further reduced the visibility of the panels from the property in question [relative to the proposals presented previously at the Statutory Consultation]. It is acknowledged that solar arrays may be visible from locations within the curtilage of the property in question [subject to further screening and design], particularly where they may be located to the north east. However, it is noted that views of the solar arrays from the existing dwelling would be partially screened by the commercial buildings within the curtilage of the property, and existing vegetation.
	Noise	2. My other concern is the noise coming from the inverters from the panels and the cooling fans in the battery storage on quiet summers evenings out in the garden	No	Following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period and ahead of the DCO submission, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove the Battery Energy Storage System from the Proposed Development. As such the Applicant is no longer seeking to construct a Battery Energy Storage System as part of the proposals.

		there will be a constant background noise disruption. Also if the lithium batteries overheat which can cause them to catch fire and subject to thermal runaway this can be accelerated by electrical discharge and will generate considerable heat give off toxic fumes.		It is acknowledged that the inverters are a source of noise. The location of inverters within the Site is not confirmed.
	General	3. Another major concern is that our property will be devalued by the solar farm therefore if we ever come to sell the site we will be vastly out of pocket.	No	The Proposed Development is for a temporary period of 40 years, after which the land will be returned to its current uses. There is no evidence to suggest solar panels impact house prices.
	General	Please see attached photos of the view we have now looking over the proposed solar farm site. I would like a 350-meter gap between boundary of the Solar Farm & our property boundary to minimize the impact of the solar farm.	No	As was discussed with the resident on Site, the potential location where solar arrays may be located has been moved further north, to be situated beyond the crest of the hill and contour to the north of the property in question. Views of the solar arrays in this location would be screened partially or fully by the topography. This change is formalised within the proposed Landscape Strategy Plan and Works Area Plans which are submitted for development consent. ES Chapter 7 - Figure 7.6 1-5 Landscape Strategy Plan **[REF: 6.2]**. The combination of the natural screening provided by locating the solar arrays beyond the crest of the hill, and proposed hedgerows, this will further reduce the visibility of the panels from the property in question [relative to the proposals presented previously at the Statutory Consultation]. It is acknowledged that solar arrays may be visible from locations within the curtilage of the property in question [subject to further screening and design], particularly where they may be located to the northeast. However, it is noted that views of the solar arrays from the existing dwelling would be partially screened by the commercial buildings within the curtilage of the property, and existing vegetation.

6	General	As per my email yesterday. I will be passing on my comments about communicating with you and completing this form. As you can see it is wholly difficult to type online or read and there is no button just to send it. I will be asking them to examine whether this is deliberate obstruction. As per my list of people I am sending my feedback to you, I shall also be sending this also to my MP, [redacted], who is a junior minister in the Environment Dept.	No	The Applicant notes the respondent's comments, every effort has been made to ensure that the consultation is accessible and that multiple methods for returning feedback were provided. These included an online feedback form, a printable version of the feedback form which could be free posted to the Applicant, receipt of feedback via email, and the project freephone number.